BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL LIBRARY

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

October, 1942

BUILDING FOR TOMORROW	*I. G. Matthews*	261
SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE NATURE OF RELIGION	*A. Irving Hallowell*	269
AMERICA'S HERITAGE OF COLONIAL CULTURE	*R. E. E. Harkness*	278
IMAGES OF YAHWEH	*William A. Irwin*	292
MUSIC AND MORES	*Harmon M. Gehr*	302
ROGER WILLIAMS GOES TO ROME	*Morton S. Enslin*	311
FROM OFF THE CAMPUS AND ON		319
BOOK REVIEWS		321
BOOK NOTICES		335
BOOKS RECEIVED		339
ANNUAL INDEX		341

Volume XIX Number 4

THE CROZER QUARTERLY

Published by
Crozer Theological Seminary
Chester, Pennsylvania

MORTON S. ENSLIN, Editor
RITTENHOUSE NEISSER, Business Manager

The policy of the CROZER QUARTERLY is to present investigations, discussions, and reviews in the field of religion which will prove of value and interest to the professional student of religion and to the layman.

Manuscripts, books for review, and communications for the editor should be addressed
Editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania
Business communications and subscriptions should be addressed
Business Manager of the CROZER QUARTERLY
Chester, Pennsylvania

Issued Quarterly $1.50 a year Single Numbers, 40 cents

Printed for the Crozer Theological Seminary by
THE JUDSON PRESS
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Entered as second-class matter, December 21, 1923, at the post office at Chester, Pa., under Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized December 21, 1923.

Copyright, 1942, by Crozer Theological Seminary. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

THE CROZER QUARTERLY
Vol. XIX OCTOBER, 1942 No. 4

BUILDING FOR TOMORROW[1]

I. G. MATTHEWS
Crozer Theological Seminary

Jerusalem shall be called the stable city, the sacred hill of the Lord of Hosts. Old men and old women shall sit once more in the open spaces of Jerusalem, each with his staff in his hand for very age; and the open spaces shall be full of boys and girls playing there.—Zech. 8: 3-5.

BUILDING has to do with habitations—habitations for men, for things, for animals, for gods: houses, garages, stables, or temples—and such habitations are always the creation and the peculiar expression of a particular civilization. The cave of the cave dweller, and the citadel of Berchtesgaden; the tepee of the Western Indian, and the skyscraper of New York City; the monastery, high on the lonely island cliff, and the cathedral of Chartres—each reveals the life of which it is the creation. To understand each would be to know the culture of the people, the practices and ideals of the leaders.

Building for tomorrow, then, must of necessity be adapted to the conditions and the spirit of the days that lie ahead. This is as true of those more mobile expressions of life, the intellectual and the religious, toward which our thoughts turn this morning, as it is of architecture. In the Christian church, building for tomorrow has to do with the vital principles of religion and the application and reinterpretation of them in the midst of the world upheaval of the present days.

For perspective we open the pages of history some twenty-five hundred years ago and note one of the arresting experiments in Jewish religion. From this vantage peak we may be able to separate the universal from the provincial and detect the permanent in the transient.

In the time of Zechariah (520 B.C.) the Jews had arrived at one of the crossroads in their history. Seventy years earlier, 586 B.C., Jerusalem had been demolished by the Babylonian; the walls had been battered down; princes and skilled workmen had been ruthlessly deported; wealth had been confiscated; the temple had been destroyed; and an untutored peasant population, no longer a menace to the conqueror, had been left hiding in the ravines or burrowing in the city ruins.

But in seventy years, that is, two generations, when humanity, even

[1] Baccalaureate sermon, May 31, 1942.

at low ebb, is concerned, what marvels may be accomplished! Peasants with opportunity and responsibility may bestir themselves. Seeds sown by prophet and priest may germinate. Hopes may take root in obscure places, and national and religious ideals may mature amid bare rocks and barren soil. Leaders may appear among the long underprivileged.

So was it in Judah when in 521-516 B.C. the new Persian empire, not yet twenty years old, faced world-wide rebellion. Subject peoples are never happy under the regime of a conqueror; the tribute collected and the homage demanded are always irksome. So when in 521 B.C. civil war broke out in Persia's capital the smoldering wrath against alien rule flamed up in open revolt in every land. Seven great nations, each at an earlier time superior to Persia, each humiliated by the *blitzkrieg* of Cyrus, each now declared for freedom, and each marshaled its army for liberty. Thus the doom of Persia, the upstart, seemed certain.

Strange indeed would it have been if at this time the spirit of independence and the demand for freedom had not found voice on the Judean hills. Old dreams were dreamed anew, latent energies were aroused, and the might of little Judah was enlisted for the task. Assured of victory, the peasant folk went to work with a will. True, there were difficulties. Zerubbabel, the governor, was pledged to Persia; but what are treaties where conscience and religion are concerned? True, Persia had a seasoned army, and Judah had none; but the armies of Babylonia, of Assyria, of Phrygia, of Lydia, of the Scythians, of Syria, and of Phœnicia stood across the pathway to Jerusalem. They were tenfold more secure, more inaccessible, than was Pearl Harbor six months ago.

Moreover, their religion urged them on in their adventure. Their prophets had heralded a glorious empire for them. Zerubbabel, the governor, was of the lineage of David; Joshua, the priest, was of accredited ancestry. Haggai and Zechariah assured them that rebellion was the will of Jehovah. And if there were any who still hesitated, our prophet boldly asserted that in case of a last-ditch defense, Jehovah himself would be their bulwark, a veritable wall of fire round about them. To gain complete freedom but one thing was required: rebuild the temple, reëstablish the ritual, crown Zerubbabel king, and the city will be free and impregnable. Such was the ringing message of the prophet, such the divine commission.

No wonder the people responded. They built the temple, made ready the sacrifices, planned the installation of the high priest and the coronation of the prince. They accomplished what seemed impossible, a lasting tribute to the hidden resources of any people, a memorial to Zechariah, the man of vision.

The central theme of the vision—human welfare—was the motive

power to the success of the venture. What a charming picture we find in Zech. 8:3-5. It is ancient and Oriental: happy childhood at play; the games, the songs, the dances, all carefree and unrestrained; courtesy and social obligations learned by contact with the elders; religious traditions and practices becoming familiar through observation and imitation. Child life was real life, without artificial make-believe. Old men and old women, relaxing from the arduous tasks of the midyears, seated in the gate, were an integral part of the city's activity. The wisdom of years, the kindly counsel, the benediction of gnarled hands—these added their quota to the fullness of daily accomplishment. All age groups were together, for childhood with its freshness and maturity with its restraints are but the symbols of a well-rounded community, in which the vigor of manhood and the vitality of womanhood were enshrined. Play, work, and reflection, each a part of life, all flowed together, blending in the onward-going stream of national existence.

But the lines of the vision are further strengthened by a chart for conduct (Zech. 8:16). Justice man to man must be the practice in the new city. Apart from this, humanity is scarcely human in the finest sense of the word. A healthy, happy, honest humanity is the bedrock of civilization, apart from which we build on sand.

No wonder this city, that had no walls, no gates with bars, no doors with bolts, no watchtowers, was to be called the stable, or the enduring, city. Peace within and peace without crowned the vision of the prophet. Play and work, justice and liberty, freedom and peace—these have always been the priorities of humanity in all high religions, and as such are essential and prominent in the vision of Zechariah. No building for tomorrow can with impunity disregard this, the foundation of all civilization.

Such was the vision. The response of the people of the land has been noted. The temple was rebuilt in some three years. Its dedication and the coronation of Zerubbabel, the traitor to Persia, proceeded according to plan. Then a smoke screen covers the field of action, and the horror of silence creeps across the page of Jewish history.

What happened? Silence echoes, "What happened?" Secular history, however, states that in that same year, 517 B.C., Darius the Persian sent his ever-triumphant army down to Egypt to quell rebellion there, and that victory crowned his arms. That is all. But Jerusalem lay on the highway to Egypt, and Jewish silence for seventy years betrays a tragedy. Imagination, based on knowledge of military tactics, can reproduce the scene.

Listen! Over the hills north of Jerusalem comes the rumor of an approaching army. Hark! The far-off, faint echo of a bugle. Nearer

comes the tramp, tramp, tramp of an army. Look! The outriders appear on the hilltops. The conqueror reaches the rebel city.

Then what? Zerubbabel, the traitor; Haggai and Zechariah, fifth columnists within the city; the people, the builders, all accomplices in the insurrection; did they make a determined stand against Persia? Did the high priest pile high the sacrifices on the smoking altar? Did Jehovah intervene, as sacred tradition insisted he had done so often in the past, and as his prophets had assured them he would in the present?

What happened? No answer. But the Persian passed on his way. In his wake there may have been smoldering ruins, terror, blood; and beyond doubt the Jewish hopes were scattered to the four winds of heaven.

The vision had been tragically transient. It had failed. Failed? Was Langley's vision of the heavier-than-air machine which was launched August, 1903, a failure? It stayed up, wabbling for thirty hazardous seconds, and then crashed in the Potomac, and our journalists raised the laugh at "Langley's folly." But the Langley airport is his testimony, and the ten thousand airmen who circle the globe are but the perfecting of his vision.

So Zechariah's dream of human well-being, of justice and freedom, and of human potentiality still is one of the most attractive and majestic realities in history. It was integral in the ministry of Jesus to whom the needs of mankind bulked larger than the traditions of the Elders. These are basic factors in the kingdom of man, which we so often call the kingdom of God.

Nevertheless in this human program one thing was lacking. The vision glorious was marred. It was peculiarly personal, specifically selfish. *Our* people, *our* city, *our* temple, *our* God was the burthen of the cry. *We* are the elect, *our* happiness, *our* rights, *our* privileges filled their horizon. Had the Jews of that day been more considerate of Persia, their deliverer from the Babylonian bondage, and studied their obligations to their rescuers; had they given serious thought to their honor as a people, and weighed well the penalties of rebellion; had they pondered their responsibilities in the new world order; had they been less swayed by the immediate, personal interests; and had they rigidly scrutinized the religious theories of their ancestors; then the story might have been vastly different.

In the long run, to betray humanity in the interest of personal profit must always be fatal. No Islandia, surrounded by impenetrable barriers, ever has or ever can exist. Every man is a piece of the continent. Mankind is one, and ultimately all rise or fall together. No culture can for long live to itself. Isolationism, a word used by politicians to delude the

unwary, is not found in the vocabulary of leadership. In the very nature of things it is banned from Christianity. Nationalism, legitimate love for one's country, must flow out into internationalism. Man must be hospitable to mankind, or one holocaust will follow another until all is consumed. *My* pleasure, *my* privileges, *my* rights must be coördinated with the welfare of society at large if peace and prosperity are ever to build the habitation of tomorrow. *My* sugar, *my* gasoline—sometimes called our sixth columnists—may be the prelude to our defeat.

More specifically, as in politics and commerce we hope for a new world order, more just, more generous, and more inclusive than any yet attained, so must it be in the field of religion. The molds of religious life, thought, practice, and organization must all be adjusted to present and future situations. Sectarianism, which too largely dominates Protestantism, cannot adequately function in a new, comprehensive world order. Worthy convictions always are in place, but petty differences, arising out of personal emotion and fostered by ignorance, are unworthy of the name we bear. The well-being of man—physically, intellectually, ethically, and creatively—in Abyssinia and India is much more important to the world than the perpetuation in America of some of our pet ecclesiastical shibboleths. Nothing short of a new emphasis on that which counts and wider horizons of neighborliness will insure the church of tomorrow from defeat. By losing our lives we may save them. In the place of *my* people, *my* city, *my* temple, and *my* God, let us try to understand and to appreciate *their* people, *their* city, *their* temple, and *their* God.

But another factor, no less serious, contributed to the failure of the prophet's dream. Zechariah and his colleagues were the victims of an inherited theology that was inadequate to their day and generation. The orthodox Hebrew belief at that time was that deity was almighty, able to do all things; absolute, none daring to question his acts or his authority; arbitrary, a lawgiver who was beyond the law itself. He was thought of as chiefly outside and beyond the human process; and he was influenced very largely by magical rites. Briefly interpreted in the context the belief was that, if the Jews built the temple and offered the sacrifices, prosperity would ensue, and even the Persian enemy would be put to flight by the might of Jehovah (Zech. 8:16). It was a naïve sort of pious pacifism. In short, their God was thought of as a supermagician, ready to play Santa Claus to his dear children in Jerusalem.

But their fine confidence was misplaced. Jehovah never appeared in their defense. In the hour of their agony the heavens were brass; their hope was a delusion; their faith but a broken reed that pierced the hand that leaned on it.

The origin of the above-mentioned ideas of God is well-known. In the far past man struggled to understand and to control the unknown powers that lay around and beyond him. Plagues, storms, and earthquakes, which he believed came from the gods, menaced him. To placate these hostile forces he experimented with incantations and charms, offerings and sacrifices. Sometimes these primitive experiments seemed effective, and thus certain rites won approval. Gradually, by the elimination of those forms that did not bring results, and by the addition of those that seemed to please the gods, a large body of cult practices came into being. Childish, most of it, but with it came the expert, the medicine man, the priest, to whom it provided prestige and a livelihood. Theological interpretation followed, and soon plague and ritual, each and all, were accepted as the will of the gods. To the people at large, especially among the unthinking, the ritual provided an emotional release, embodied the pattern of religion, and was vested with divine sanctions. Indeed, spells and charms are still fundamental in religion throughout the greater part of the world even today.

But it is rather strange that outmoded magic, which originated in primitive paganism, should still be found within the precincts of the Christian church. Witchcraft was firmly believed in by many of our revered New England churchmen not so long ago. Incantations and spells are yet considered potent by many religious leaders. The blessing of the bells, the blessing of the army, the prayers in Westminster Abbey for peace, even the usual benediction, all come perilously close to magic. Days are considered holy; water made holy by magical words is believed to wash away sins; bread and wine, when consecrated, become the very flesh and blood of Jesus; a building is made sacred, and then in some strange way the odor of sanctity brings peace to the troubled mind of the sinner who spends an hour therein.

Magic, no doubt, because of its great antiquity, its claim to secret power, its sensuous symbolism, and its emotional appeal, does find a response in many minds. But it is not the response of life. It is soothing, a drug that deadens sensitivities. It provides a comfortable religion, that never interferes overmuch with private morals. With priestly aid it ignores personal responsibility and drops all one's burdens in the lap of a good god. But as such, in religion, it is a soporific to humanity. Neither clarifying the mind nor purifying the morals, it cannot be the savor of life unto life. We become irritated when a leading student of religion says, "Religion is that which places obstacles in the way of human energies"; but that definition is no caricature of much of the present emphasis in the church.

Past or present, such puerile performances can scarcely be expected

to influence the Eternal any more than they could turn aside the stars in their courses. The smoking sacrifice and the priestly appeal filled the temple in the days of Zechariah, but no response came from above. Jehovah was to be a wall of fire round about the Holy City, but he felt under no obligation to keep the appointment. Earlier it had been declared time and time again that all such priestly jugglery was an abomination to him. What he required was "to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with your God."

Further, if magic is foreign to true religion, then God cannot be the master magician. This, in part, we have learned.

Primitive man by his magic called on deity to quiet the storms, to restrain the floods, to send the rains, to fertilize the fields. He thought that sometimes the gods heard and answered his cry. Modern man has learned to drain the marshes, to dike the channels, to build the dams, to mulch the soil. He sees the fruitage of his labor, and knows that he is master.

Primitive man suffered from disease and plague. By means of spells and sacrifices he sought to appease the offended spirits. In due time the plague died down, and the survivors were convinced that their magic had power with the plague god. Modern man has met all the old-time diseases, but he has gone into the laboratory, has experimented, and has discovered not only the germs, the carriers of the disease, but also the cures thereof, the toxins and the sulphanilamides. He knows he has wiped out or can wipe out the plagues.

So we might illustrate throughout the economic, the social, the ethical, and the religious areas of human experience. But enough: God is no magician, and dependence on him to act as such was and is a delusion.

Dr. Charles Watson, president of the American University in Cairo, Egypt, has what he calls his room for evangelism. It is the science laboratory. Here he brings his Moslem friends, who, like the Hebrews of old, believe that God does everything, that man can do nothing, nothing, only to lie at his feet. God sends the rain and the storm, the famine and the plague, and in all things does as he chooses. When Watson gets a good Moslem in the laboratory, he proceeds to unite hydrogen and oxygen in proportion of two to one and produces raindrops before the eyes of the wondering Moslem. He goes further and makes thunder and lightning, he makes the grass to grow. He shows the student the germs that cause the plague; he multiplies them and kills them at will. The thoughtful Moslem enters the laboratory with his agelong faith that Allah alone does all these things. He leaves with the foundations of his inherited superstitions shattered forever, for with his own eyes he has seen a man do all these things. A room for evangelism of this high type would be

profitable for most of us. It should slough off at least some of our prehistoric thinking.

Members of the graduating class of 1942, builders for tomorrow; the old world is being shaken to its very foundations. Walls are crumbling; the patterns of yesterday are going to the scrap heap. Our order is in the throes of death and life.

The church, as a whole, is complacent, undisturbed. She is as sedate as were the senators of old Rome, who in the time of the barbarian invasion dressed up in their robes of state and sat serenely in the palace porches, a superior caste, to the wonderment of the conquering rabble. But their dignity and their learning did not quench the torch nor stay the slaughter. Rome fell.

The church is in the midst of the onrushing chaos. If she persists, she must live in, and serve in, a new world order. To do so, she must have a true reverence for that power outside ourselves that makes for righteousness. God is not a capricious potentate, favoring a few specially elected people, Jew or Aryan, Occidental or Oriental; nor is he a puppet, subservient to the beck and call of a sacerdotal priesthood; nor is he a scapegoat for human indolence. Like the forces of the universe, he is law-abiding and righteous altogether. He works, but only in ways that are normal to humanity.

Also the church must believe in the primacy of man. There is no Greek nor barbarian, no bond nor free in true religion. All men are brothers, and, in the words of Jesus, all are the children of God.

We are told that when the British planned to attack the citadel of Quebec in 1759, the War Office called in the generals one by one according to age. The oldest shook his head and said, "Impossible." The middle-aged said that it would be very difficult, risky, and all but impossible. Wolfe, the youngest of all, said: "I'll do it or die in the attempt." He did both.

Building for tomorrow is the great adventure which we are facing. Let us learn our lessons from the past, but keep our faces toward the light, and go forward in the spirit of the Master who is the way, the truth, and the life.

SOME REFLECTIONS ON THE NATURE OF RELIGION

A. IRVING HALLOWELL

University of Pennsylvania

THOSE of us who study and reflect upon the life of peoples with widely varying cultural backgrounds are at times inclined to overemphasize the differences that we find. This is natural enough since one of our primary tasks is to record these very differences. In fact one of the major contributions of cultural anthropology has been to extend enormously the range of our knowledge concerning the variations in human languages, religious beliefs and practices, social customs, art forms, technologies, and so on. It is only in the present century that reliable information of this type about the aboriginal peoples of the world has been put at the disposal of scholars.

However, there is another task of equal importance. This involves the study of the *constant* categories of human thought and behavior that characterize mankind and of how they are to be accounted for. Here we are confronted with a whole series of universals that lie implicit in the very classification of our data. Were it not for certain recurrent phenomena, the study of languages, arts, religions, or other aspects of culture in common terms would long ago have proved impossible, since there would be no basis for comparison. This may be a commonplace today, but it is none the less highly significant that human cultural phenomena *are* everywhere comparable and that we may look forward to a time when more and more accurate generalizations will be made.[1]

Religion, then, may be examined as a human phenomenon, even if any specific reflections upon this topic must necessarily be of a tentative nature, since probably no scholar can rightly claim firsthand detailed knowledge of all the material now available upon religious beliefs and practices throughout the entire range of human history. But even a sampling of this vast storehouse of knowledge suggests certain hypotheses about the fundamental nature of religion and some of the reasons for its universality and persistence as a human institution.

Any discussion of religion cannot proceed very far without reference to magic, to which it is sometimes theoretically opposed. That is to say, religion is said to reflect attitudes of persuasion, petition, or propitiation toward a supernatural realm, while magic is said to represent attitudes of coercion, constraint, or compulsion. J. G. Frazer is the scholar chiefly

[1] In this connection it is worth noting that there is no scientific basis for assuming innate differences in racial mentality, nor for any other fundamental biological differences that set off the "uncivilized" people from the "civilized."

responsible for this opposition, but his views have not gone unchallenged. One recent writer, who has made a penetrating critical analysis of the views on magic and religion held by a number of outstanding scholars, remarks that "the so-called opposition of magic to religion is itself an anthropological superstition that is manifestly at variance with the facts of experience."[2] An examination of the actual data from many societies, in short, suggests that Frazer's opposition is a neat abstraction, logical rather than socio-psychological. The spell and the prayer, for example, are difficult to separate in many Melanesian communities when the data are subjected to close scrutiny. As Cooper says in reference to the magico-religious dichotomy,

> In many rites and observances it is impossible for us to make out plainly which of the two attitudes is present or dominant. In others, the two attitudes coexist side by side, or blend one into the other. In still others, one or other of the two attitudes is clearly the sole or dominant one.[3]

Consequently, to assume the rigid dichotomy that is implied by the terms *religion* and *magic* when these are conceptually opposed, may prejudice a genuine understanding of the phenomena we set out to comprehend. In any particular case such an artificial segregation of data at the outset of a study may produce results that are quite unrealistic if we are interested in the significance of magico-religious phenomena as they function in the lives of actual human beings rather than in manipulating the data as an intellectual exercise. For, as Maitra has well phrased it,

> . . . religion may be not merely a blend of magic and prayer, it may also be almost wholly one or other of these, or again something which is neither prayer nor magic but an experience altogether different from both. Just as life manifests itself in a wide variety of forms ranging from the invertebrate to the vertebrate, and from anthropoid apes to men and the different races and subraces of men, so religion may realise itself in an indefinite variety of forms without either exhausting or completely losing itself in any single type or form. We may have religions of compulsion and religions of propitiation as also religions of contemplation and religions of mystical absorption just as we may have life in the insects and life in the lower animals and life in man and perhaps also life in superhuman beings to be.[4]

Thus, there being excellent empirical grounds for extending the connotations of the term *religion* to include the essential phenomena of magic, the verbal aspects of the question are less essential than a clear comprehension of what we are talking about. Irrespective of vocabu-

[2] S. Maitra, "Religion and Magic: Being an Examination of the Views of Frazer, Marett, Leuba and Swanton," in *Journal of the Department of Letters,* University of Calcutta, XXVII, no. 2 (1935), p. 13.

[3] J. M. Cooper, "The Origin and Early History of Religion," in *Primitive Man,* II, nos. 3 and 4 (1929), p. 33.

[4] *Op. cit.,* p. 12.

lary, what we are actually talking about, when *either* magic or religion is referred to, are *relations* between the conduct and experience of human beings and what they believe to be the most vital dynamic forces of their universe. This is not only an intelligible and distinctive realm of discourse, it is one that is open to specific inquiry among all peoples in all times and places. For, granted a set of beliefs about the nature of the world, the motivation for such behavior is universal.

> It is altogether natural that man in his strivings for physical and "spiritual" life should endeavour to make use of every kind of power in the existence of which he believes. If forces of several different natures appear to him to be active in the world, it is to be expected that they will all be eagerly and uncritically pressed into service, each one according to its nature.[5]

A Christian, for example, prays to God because he believes the deity to represent the ultimate and most powerful dynamic force in his universe. A Saulteaux Indian isolates himself in the forest and undertakes to fast for several days and nights in order to obtain a blessing. He interprets his dreams (or visions) as visitations from spiritual beings—the *pawaganak* (guardian spirits)—because he believes that this kind of psychic experience has brought him into direct contact with some of the prime movers of his cosmos. A Melanesian utters a spell in the course of planting his yam garden because he believes that by means of these words certain dynamic forces of his universe can be put into action. Subsequently the Christian may find that his prayer has been answered, the Indian that his dream blessing has proved an aid to him, and the Melanesian that his garden flourishes.

In all these cases we can discern an integral connection between belief, conduct, and experience. Belief furnishes the blueprint for action and a guide to the interpretation of experience, for the individual believer can always produce evidence from his personal experience, or from that of his associates, which validates belief. He can point to events that appear to demonstrate that it is possible to make effective use of, or enter into some vital relation with, the dynamic forces of his universe that are postulated in his belief system.[6]

In order to understand religious conduct and experience, therefore, it is of the utmost importance to be acquainted with the relevant system of beliefs of a people. However, merely to catalogue the beliefs of a people, or the overt forms of worship or of magical practice is insufficient. Without reference to the personal experience of actual individuals the picture we receive is distorted and incomplete, and, if we

[5] James H. Leuba, *A Psychological Study of Religion* (1912), p. 3.

[6] Cf. A. I. Hallowell, "Some Empirical Aspects of Northern Saulteaux Religion," in *American Anthropologist*, XXXVI (1934), pp. 389-404.

centre too much attention on the details of beliefs and practices alone, we may overlook the fact that religion always has a pragmatic aspect. This fact never escapes us in the practice of our own religion but it may very well do so when we approach the exotic systems of beliefs of strange peoples. Yet the significant psychological fact is simply that all peoples, including ourselves, put religious beliefs to the pragmatic test in experience. This constitutes one of the constant factors in religion everywhere that makes our data psychologically comparable and intelligible. While different systems of beliefs involve different sets of premises about the nature of the world, the individuals who interpret personal experience and observation in terms of them become firmly convinced that by acting in accordance with the dogmas entertained about the relations of man to the dynamic forces of the universe, they can promote their own welfare and achieve many things they most desire. This is of great significance for an understanding of human psychology since it means that despite the greatest diversity in the content and patterning of belief, conduct, and experience in different societies, human beings everywhere find the universe intelligible in their own provincial terms. There is meaning and order to it; things do not simply happen by chance. The deepest roots of the vitality of religion lie in this essential fact.

In this, man differs from the infrahuman primates and the lower animals who lack the capacity for this kind of psychological adaptation to the world. These creatures do not exhibit behavior attributable to *beliefs* about the dynamic forces of their world, nor do they have the capacity for evaluating experience in terms of belief. Religion is an exclusively human phenomenon because without speech as a tool for refining and elaborating concepts about the world and communicating experience, the world of the animal cannot be constituted in the meaningful terms that are the matrix of religion in *homo sapiens*.[7] The subhuman animal is forced to adapt himself to life in an entirely different way.

Man, on the other hand, is not only natively equipped to make practical and material adjustments on a higher level than any other animal; he has the capacity for making psychological adaptations of a more complex order. While we can never know the precise details, in a truly historical sense, of the earliest human conceptions of the universe, this much can be said: In order to live in a world in which he was never thoroughly secure and could not fully understand, man, nevertheless, had to act in it. He could not look out upon the world as a passive spectator —an armchair philosopher. Events called for an explanation; not as a

[7] Cf. James H. Leuba, *op. cit.*, chap. III, "Magic, Religion and the Animal Mind." Among other things Leuba points out that both magic and religion involve a capacity for reacting to absent and unperceived objects in a way that is impossible for animals.

matter of mere intellectual curiosity, but because something had to be done—some action taken. And in order to act effectively man came to make certain assumptions about the nature of things, based on his observation and experience. Expectations came to be entertained; ideas of causation developed, ideas necessarily involving what we now call metaphysical assumptions, theories, about the fundamental nature of things and why things happen as they do. The systems of beliefs of mankind that we know teem with this sort of data. Man, in short, exercised his capacities not only in adapting himself to the immediate physical exigencies of his environment, but by developing assumptions about the ultimate nature of things.

Beliefs of this order came to embody concepts about the nature and character of the universe as an entirety, about man's place in it and notions about the best ways of dealing with the dynamic forces that controlled things. From one point of view such systems of belief are philosophies of nature but not consciously elaborated and refined philosophical systems such as we are familiar with in the higher cultures.

A recognition of this fact dispels some of the confusion that has been created by identifying everything that has been called religious or magical with the *supernatural.* In one sense of the term, nature may be thought of as the *existential* in an inclusive sense and philosophies of nature, as hypotheses or speculations about whatever forces or beings are *believed* to exist. In such a frame of reference gods as well as men may be given legitimate ontological status. If, on the other hand, we begin by postulating a natural-supernatural dichotomy we are confronted with the necessity for discriminating the two realms with the utmost care. This is no simple task and it may indeed involve distortion when we try to apply it to the systems of beliefs of all peoples. Such a distinction reflects the recent history of western European thought[8] rather than any basic dichotomy in the thought of mankind as a whole.

Among the Indians that I know at first hand, the Saulteaux, man, animals, plants, and spiritual beings of several orders (some anthropomorphic and some not) are all conceived to be part of one interrelated order of existence. It is true that the spiritual beings have superhuman powers but some human beings through the aid of spiritual helpers also exhibit extraordinary powers. But in neither case does the term *"supernatural"* seem appropriate. All that can rightly be said is that a wide

[8] Here it has led to some curious results, as for example, the view that man himself is not a part of nature, shown in the following passage from Jos. P. Thompson, *Man in Genesis and Geology,* 1870: ". . . in the present stage of science I may safely lay down the postulate that man had a beginning and that Nature is not proved adequate to have caused that beginning. He appeared upon the plane of Nature with an organism that Nature fails to account for and with power for which Nature furnishes no precedents." Today it would be hard to argue that man is not as much a part of nature as a tree, a flower, a cloud, or the lower animals.

variation in powers is postulated for various orders of sentient beings in the existential universe.

From my point of view, religious beliefs are not beliefs about the supernatural but about how the existential or natural order, as variously conceived, is believed to work from the point of view of man as a part of that order. What may be called the magico-religious techniques—worship, prayer, sacrifice, spell, etc.—are the appropriate modes of conduct which man employs in order to satisfy certain of his needs. This leads us to consider how man actually views himself in relation to the other beings and powers that he assumes to exist in his world. We seem to be confronted here with what appears to be another universal fact.

Despite the utmost variety in the concrete content of systems of beliefs, everywhere man views himself as *subordinate* in position to other beings and powers. It is remarkable how this view of things has remained constant despite the widest variations in the technical equipment of different cultures and the consequent wide differences in potentialities for the actual control of the physical environment. It appears that man has never conceived himself to be the complete master of his fate. He always pictures himself as in some way dependent upon, or in certain circumstances greatly in need of, the assistance of superior powers in order to achieve certain ends that he desires.

It is worth noting, too, that the beings to whom man believes himself subordinate are not necessarily high gods or deities associated with some natural phenomenon like the sun. They may be no more than previously deceased human beings, that is, ancestral ghosts. One example must suffice. Hogbin, writing of the people of Ontong Java, says,

> The *kipua* [unmaterial part of a human being] are able to observe all human conduct, are aware of all hidden motives, and are able directly to influence the fate of their living relatives. This influence is strongest when the person with whom they were associated has only recently died. Without them no birth can take place, and they are responsible for all illness and practically all deaths. They influence the weather, help the fisherman and the sorcerer and in a hundred and one ways affect the lives of men.[9]

Thus, while the form and character of spiritual beings superior to man and exercising some authority over him show extreme variability, the fact remains that man's subordinate position in the cosmos appears to remain constant. The necessary psychological inference to be drawn from these universal facts is that man from the beginning of his career on earth sensed his *actual* insecurity in the universe. Possibly the common

[9] Natives of a coral atoll lying northeast of the Solomon Islands. H. I. Hogbin, *Law and Order in Polynesia* (1934), p. 144.

hazards of life—misfortune, sickness, and death—reinforced this view. At any rate, this attitude has persisted.

A corollary psychological fact is this: In the very nature of the case the relations between man and the dynamic forces of his universe are emotionally toned. Insecurity creates anxiety, and there is a basic need for a resolution of such a tension. If this be true, it also suggests an explanation of why we find that man does not view the dynamic forces at work in his universe with aloof detachment and mere intellectual curiosity. His relations to them are too vital for that because many aspects of his own welfare—in fact his very life—may be dependent upon satisfactory coöperation with them, or utilization of them. He must constantly take such beings and forces into account if he wants to get the most out of life.

This leads us to the basic importance of conduct in the total picture and to the reason why the nexus between belief and conduct is so close. In referring to conduct, I am not only thinking of magico-religious conduct of certain kinds, ritual acts, for example, which must be performed for reasons that concern the welfare of a given society. I am thinking rather of that category of conduct—the *mores*—which reflect the characteristic values of the social order. In many societies devoid of political authority and having no organized penal sanctions of any sort, the social order is reinforced by the belief that spiritual powers or forces of an order superior to man will punish him through disease or death for infraction of the *mores*. Such consequences may follow automatically because that is the very nature of things.[10] Or the authority to punish men may be lodged in spiritual beings of one kind or another. In any case, man's subordinate position in the universe is conceived in such a way that the hazards of life are interpreted as penalties for moral transgressions. This means that beliefs about the nature of the forces in the world function as the basis of sanctions for moral conduct.

On the other hand, the individual finds that he can secure all kinds of positive benefits by utilizing the traditional magico-religious techniques of his society. Magic, *e.g.*, may be available to make plants grow, to secure animals or a woman. Or, as among the Saulteaux, the individual may lay claim to blessings from spiritual beings by undergoing a puberty fast. Such blessings may also be conditional, *i.e.*, the individual must fulfill certain subsequent obligations.

This positive side of the relation between human beings and beings superior to them was formulated by a native of the Solomon Islands as follows: "It is like the market. On the beach you have seen us exchange

[10] See, *e.g.*, the discussion of disease as a sanction in Saulteaux society in A. I. Hallowell, "The Social Function of Anxiety in a Primitive Society," in *American Sociological Review*, VI (Dec., 1941).

taro for fish. In the hills we carry out our funeral rites, sacrifices and dances to please the *akalo* [ancestral spirits]. We exchange weeping, pigs and dancing for their good will. Then they give us what we ask." The author continues, "Several times I heard people say after a sacrifice that now their affairs would progress satisfactorily. 'The spirits are pleased . . . they will hear the priest's prayer. Our taro and yams will grow, our pigs will multiply, there will be many children, and we shall not fall sick.' "[11] What does this indicate? It shows that by acting in certain ways—whether ritually or in observing the *mores*—one can offset the insecurity that the hazards of life present.

By stressing the integration of conduct and the system of beliefs in human cultures I hope I have not conveyed the idea that magico-religious beliefs are insipid or intellectualistic. What is actually required is faith as well. The individual must be *confident* that the action will be followed by the expected consequences. This means that the individual will be sensitized to reflect upon events of various categories and find in them a substantiation of his beliefs. In this way personal observation and experience is brought into close connection with action and belief. That is to say, experience and belief must be harmonized if beliefs are to retain their authority as the premises for action. Individuals must find in their own experience the answer to their prayers; they must discover for themselves that love magic or hunting magic works, or that punishment follows sin. Experience is thus the crux of magico-religious ratification.[12]

The matrix of the integration of belief, conduct, and experience in the individual is to be found in the socialization of the child. The individual has to be trained to accept certain views of the world and its dynamic forces. This process of socialization is universal, and we know that it works because if it did not we would not have these cultural phenomena. Every culture system, however, is a *provincial* system. Its beliefs, values, and attitudes have definite limits in time and space. Each one creates a behavioral environment or order of psychological reality in which the individuals within it live. Thus, the universe in which we human beings live is always in large part a culturally constituted universe.

The dogmas in each cultural system can change, however. A challenge may arise from the reflection of some creative thinker or from contacts with peoples with some other system of beliefs.

A new type of challenge to the traditional views of the universe has followed the rise of science in western civilization. Science has created a new method of investigating the dynamic forces of the universe.

[11] H. I. Hogbin, *Experiments in Civilization: The Effect of European Culture on a Native Community of the Solomon Islands* (1939), p. 107.

[12] Cf. M. F. Ashley-Montagu, *Coming into Being among the Australian Aborigines* (1937), chap. 14, "Tradition, Experience, and Belief," particularly pp. 339 ff.

It has presented us with a view of the universe that demands another type of action than that derived from the assumptions that are characteristic of magico-religious systems of belief. This explains why individuals whose views of the nature of things have been influenced by the results of scientific investigation behave in ways that are different from those of persons who still accept the traditionally religious ideas. It explains why they have abandoned certain techniques like prayer and sacrifice as a means of attaining desired ends. It also explains why such persons no longer feel that illness is a kind of punishment. Greater security in the face of this hazard of life is to be found in competent medical care or hygienic precautions. But even with this great change conduct and experience still remain integrated with belief. It is the intellectual frame of reference that has shifted.

As a result of scientific knowledge it is possible to say that the magico-religious beliefs of primitives are false. But it is also possible to challenge certain Christian dogmas on the same basis. On the other hand, science has not given us a complete or final account of the nature of things. Nor has man yet been able to overcome the fact that there are still insecurities that beset him on every side.

If, and when, human society is organized in such a fashion that an optimum of mental and physical health and material welfare is secured for each individual; if, and when, measures are taken to insure the development of a character structure that will enable the individual to handle his aggressive and other impulses with a minimum of damage to himself and others so that he can more freely enjoy the satisfaction of living; if, and when, individuals can learn to face misfortune, sickness, and death with an equanimity born of genuine psychological maturity—*then,* perhaps man will no longer require the psychological compensation that religion offers him in less secure and well-ordered worlds.

AMERICA'S HERITAGE OF COLONIAL CULTURE

R. E. E. HARKNESS

Crozer Theological Seminary

The first settlements by the English in America are interesting, not alone because of the quaint customs and manners portrayed there and the heroism we may sentimentally accord to these hardy people from the old land creating a new civilization on America's barren soil, but because the new culture each established has had its influence to some degree at least on our total American life. I wish to speak of our heritage from five of these English colonies.

I

Virginia was founded in 1606–1607 by a corporation for business purposes; therefore the adventurers were interested chiefly in securing a profitable return on their investment. These settlers were not animated by a particular religious ideal, yet their objective was affected by religious considerations. That is, they paid a great deference to religion in order that their enterprise might prove a success. In accordance with the view of the day, God's favor must be sought and his will recognized if their project was to be successfully promoted. Religion was an accompaniment of their endeavor. It was the safety element, the promise of security, the assurance of divine sanction, a means to an end rather than the end itself.

As Englishmen, one of their first requirements was political freedom, and representative government was founded as early as 1619. A little bit of England had been transferred to Virginian soil. English forms were transplanted—the English way of life, which, so far as religion was concerned, included the State Church. There was no well-defined social objective to be attained, no utopian scheme of a new human society. English people had come to live in America. True, the scheme was colored by the new emerging emphasis upon human rights and equality of opportunity, but the basic element was the right of Englishmen which had been guaranteed by the Magna Carta. Consequently even the later opposition to the established church was in the name of personal freedom, the freedom of Englishmen. With all that may be said concerning the opposition of Dissenters in the latter half of the eighteenth century, history compels the statement that they had strong support among the Anglicans themselves—Patrick Henry, George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, if all these may be classed among the adherents of the church.

Thus in Virginia the American Revolution was fought not so much to win political independence from the mother country but to secure personal freedom—the rights of Englishmen which guaranteed political and religious freedom.

II

Massachusetts Bay Colony was established in 1630 by a Puritan corporation. Professedly the purpose of the new organization was trade, as the royal charter granted. But the good Puritans hoodwinked the king and his council. The real purpose was the erection in New England of a new society strictly in accord with the revealed will of God. Immediately, therefore, the charter was received the Corporation moved its effects, including the charter, to Massachusetts and there set up a theocracy.

The Puritans, led by men who had been trained in Calvin's school in Geneva, accepted the Scriptures as the revelation of the divine order for the children of men at all times and in all places. The rules, regulations, laws, mandates delivered by the Almighty to Moses were not for him alone nor for his people only, but for all people in all ages. The form of government for men, fashioned in heaven by the Eternal before the foundation of the world, was a theocracy, whose laws and institutions were to be discovered only in his Holy Word.

This was a philosophy and social structure alien to England which was forced to come to America because it was impossible to root it in old English soil. Under such a government there could be no personal freedom, either political or religious. The foundation of the entire edifice was religion, and all the requirements thereof had been foreseen and declared by God, even as he had given instructions to the righteous Noah for the building of the ark. Consequently in Massachusetts, as in all other Puritan colonies in New England, strict conformity and uniformity were enforced. There was but one form of religious worship and practice permissible for the people, and all were compelled to submit to it. Logically, therefore, only members of the churches, organized according to colonial law drawn upon the Bible, could be free citizens of the colony.

The cherished principle of Englishmen that government is derived from the people and is based upon the consent of the governed was denied in theocracy. Said John Winthrop, their upright, judicious governor: "Democracy is among civil nations accounted the meanest and worst of all forms of Government." And his views and words were echoed by that man of God, John Cotton, his own beloved and honored pastor of the Boston church: "Democracy, I do not conceive that ever

God did ordeyne as a fit government eyther for church or commonwealth. If the people be Governors who shall be governed?"

That is a fair question! But for us it is proof that personal freedom was not enjoyed in this colony. Massachusetts Bay was a community or constitutional society. Its bond was the compact or covenant creating a consciousness of mutual responsibility and public obligation. Moreover, it was not of man but of God. Society with all its institutions—political, religious, economic, domestic—was sacred, ordained of him. Man existed for them, not they for man. He, the sinner, depraved, found his good—salvation—only as he submitted to these holy institutions, essential factors of the Creator's plan.

In the Revolution, then, Massachusetts fought solely in the interests of political freedom, to win independence from the mother country with whom she had been in rebellion from the first days of colonization. For her the Revolution was not a struggle for personal liberty in religion. That, indeed, was a detestable thing in the eyes of the Puritan statesman and divine. They did not claim it for themselves. Because Roger Williams, Anne Hutchinson, Dr. John Clarke, Obadiah Holmes, and scores of others did demand it, they were banished from the confines of the colony. There was but one revelation, and the Puritan devoutly and loyally accepted it, a slave to its law. Complete religious freedom for the individual citizen in Massachusetts was not granted until 1833, many years after the War of Independence had been won and the Constitution of the United States had been ratified.

III

The settlement of Rhode Island was distinctly a religious adventure. Denied freedom in religious exercises within the jurisdiction of Massachusetts, many of her inhabitants moved beyond her borders and organized their government upon the unclaimed lands of the Narragansett. Their fundamental agreement was freedom in conscience personally; separation of state and church governmentally.

Rhode Island was unlike either Virginia or Massachusetts. She was not England—not a miniature England set in a new, fair frame as these other two might claim to be. Nor was she a body of English people denying their own mother. She was the new England—the England that was to be. The England of transition in that glorious, agonized seventeenth century. An England born out of due time on the strange, barren soil of America. The England that sought to be, in sorrow and striving, and failed to be in the Cromwellian Commonwealth—an abortion in the old land. She was the England of hope and vision, of daring faith and long struggle. Not of well-defined project but in fashion of tradition

the England working out her welfare, muddling through. Charles II, granting his charter to these few visionaries, who were without legal right or royal authority to the land they occupied, declared that they were trying a new and daring experiment and he wanted them to have the guarantee of assurance that they could so do. And gratefully these outcasts called it an "Holie Experiment."

The laws of the new commonwealth were English. Frankly these settlers adopted the legislation of the home land and adapted it to their own peculiar needs. There was nothing sacred in this world but mankind. There was nothing finished or complete. Men could experiment—not only had they the right to do so, they had the duty to do so. In Rhode Island we discover one of the first evidences of human or social or scientific approach to the problems of the race.

It is the first truly American State. Most of the Rhode Island inhabitants came from other American settlements, not direct from England. They did not so much adjust themselves to the new American conditions as they created new American conditions—indeed, new world conditions. Rhode Island began in 1636 where other colonies arrived in 1776. These people asserted not so much the rights of Englishmen, or natural rights guaranteed by English law and constitution, as natural human rights which English law could neither bestow nor abrogate. So their first charter said nothing concerning religious liberty because Roger Williams insisted that this was an inalienable right which government could neither grant nor deny. The Indian in Rhode Island enjoyed certain rights denied elsewhere, such, for instance, as title to his land to be bought by the Englishmen, simply because he was a human being. The Turk, pagan, papist likewise must be assured freedom in the performance of his religious duties because he is a man, a member of the race.

That is a scientific observation, a fact discernible in the history of mankind. God had given rights to all people. All men, whatever their race, religion, or creed, claimed freedom of conscience, the bounden necessity of obedience to the will of God as it was conceived. Moreover, the government and religion of all or any people had proved acceptable unto God. He in his wisdom had accorded them the right to fashion their own forms. That was a scientific fact, though three hundred years ago these authorities of Rhode Island phrased their conceptions and convictions in theological terminology. It was for this full and complete freedom of the individual, denounced as license by some, that Rhode Island fought in the Revolution and fearful lest it be jeopardized the State hesitated long to ratify the Constitution.

IV

Another interesting settlement was in the Carolinas. These territories were first colonized by squatters—rebels in politics, dissenters in religion. This is true especially of North Carolina. Associates of Nathaniel Bacon in the rebellion of 1676 against Governor Berkeley had fled across the border from Virginia when that uprising was suppressed. Baptists, Quakers, and others refusing to submit to the Establishment found freedom in this as yet unorganized land. When the proprietorship was granted by Charles II to a number of his friends and the Fundamental Constitutions of Locke were adopted in the latter half of the century this spirit of rebellion was all the more pronounced. The reactionary form of government bred increased lawlessness and revolt.

South Carolina was colonized more especially by dissenters who came from the mother country about 1680, the period characterized at home by John Bunyan. Deprived of their franchise by the intolerant religious laws, they sought refuge across the seas. They were English folk, bred in the provincial Englishman's love of personal liberty and the right to manage his own affairs. These views, customs, and traditions they brought with them to America and planted them firmly in this southern soil. They were people of character, confirmed in their convictions through persecution suffered—men and women of a fine, inherited culture. Early we find them giving serious attention to education and organized community life and granting prerogatives according to their ancient English laws. As in Virginia, the rights of men in all respects, were, they believed, guaranteed and assured by that ancient constitution of England, written and unwritten.

So South Carolina had its birth in religious hopes and motives. But its society was not basically a theological structure. Authority was founded in political government which confirmed the full privileges of all its members. All citizens were therefore equal before the law, and the essential freedom of speech, worship, and opportunity was protected thereby.

V

The last colony to which I shall refer is Pennsylvania, founded by William Penn in 1681, the Quaker settlement. Abhorred by the authorities of state and church at home and in the Americas, the Quakers found no welcome in any community—save, perhaps, Rhode Island. Their extreme emphasis upon the equality of men because of the supreme worth of each prevented them from paying homage or, what might seem to others to be, proper respect to duly elected officers of either civil or ecclesiastical government. It was George Fox himself who said he would

doff the hat and scrape the leg to no man. And true to his counselling, disciples of his in Massachusetts Bay Colony brought to trial before Governor John Endicott stood with hats on their heads and called him plain John.

Exiled from almost all jurisdictions, they sought a refuge where they might put into practice their own peculiar tenets. Their opportunity came when Penn was granted his proprietorship by Charles II and Pennsylvania provided an opportunity for a Quaker experiment in government. Accepting this, their own word for it, we must think of this colony as a religious establishment, government being according to the will of God as that will was understood by the Friends.

As such it assured religious toleration, not religious freedom. In the first place, only Christians could enjoy the right of franchise and only orthodox Christians at that. They must be Trinitarians and conform to certain other requirements as well.

It must be admitted that in this colony the Quakers had their opportunity unhindered and unopposed, with royal grant of charter, to put into practice their own conceptions of a Christian social order. Their only opposition was to be found in human nature. Were they sufficiently realistic to recognize that fact?

As Englishmen they brought with them to the new world their heritage of English culture and customs, as did the other colonists. But so far as external authority was concerned they had been granted complete freedom to observe these and establish their ways of life—political, economic, domestic, and religious—as the Friends believed God desired. Pennsylvania was free, fallow ground for sowing the good seed of a new society. Like Rhode Island it offered a golden opportunity to carry out an "Holie Experiment" in constructing a new fellowship among men.

Before considering America's heritage from each of these colonies, the question may arise, Why was it that people of the same race, nation, traditions, and culture could have such diversities of religious views regarding the will of God for the achievement of human welfare? One answer, and I think the main one, is that, contemporary as all these groups were so far as the seventeenth century is concerned, nevertheless each one represents a stage in the development of English nationalism as expressed in the religious reformation and the growth of democracy.

Virginia was settled first by merchant traders, the rising middle class of the Puritan persuasion in religion. After it became a Crown Colony in 1624 it was increasingly influenced by the Cavalier immigration, more strictly Anglican in doctrine and practice. These brought to the infant colony the fine aristocratic elements of English life. They

also represent the early stage of English nationalism, her assertive independence among the nations of the world. The spirit was not particularly religious but political—patriotic perhaps—the right of Englishmen to manage their own affairs in protest to papal authority, the interference of a foreign prince in matters of local concern, and the right of Englishmen also to enjoy the promise and bounty of a new world in spite of the presumptions of Spain, imperial upon the continent of Europe and mistress of the seas.

Massachusetts, or Puritanism, marks the second stage in this reformation or growth of nationalism which reached its strength some thirty years after the period represented by the Virginian settlement. But Puritanism is not English. It is foreign to her genius, something that was forced upon her culture due to the exigencies caused by the painful conflict in the evolution of her own religious institutions and the unhappy results in the transfer of the ruling dynasty. Puritanism is Roman, stemming from the Roman lawyer, John Calvin. It sought to guide, control, and legalize this new movement in national and religious progress. Now, if there is anything the Englishman detests and will not endure, it is authoritative control or dictatorial management. He wants to do things in his own traditional way and to let affairs take their natural course. He has respect for law, as custom and mores, but little for laws, especially if they are restrictive and sumptuary. But Calvinism, as expressed in Puritanism, wanted to direct this reformation by prohibitory laws, robbing the individual of free choice in determining life's interests and pursuits.

Rhode Island and South Carolina mark a distinct advance in the progress of English democracy, that is, representative government. Their conception of government was the parliamentarian: government deriving from the people and resting upon consent of the governed. Their forms and institutions were developed in that fierce struggle of the seventeenth century to found liberty in law—the English Civil War which resulted in the beheading of the king, but the successful achievement of which was the long sought subjection of Monarchy, Lords, and Commons to law.

Pennsylvania reflects a still further advance in English political philosophy. It was an extreme radicalism manifested by a suspicion of, if not a protest against, all external authority. The doctrine of the Inner Light had its political counterpart in a restiveness under governmental discipline. It must be remembered that George Fox began his preaching in 1647 in the midst of the rising tide of the army's might, which later in righteous wrath "purged" Parliament of its constitutional power in its resolve "to call Charles Stuart, that man of blood, to an account for the blood shed in the war."

Quakerism represents a true democracy and is the logical outcome of the revolution which succeeded in bringing Charles to judgment and to his death. By his beheading, every man was made a king; and by that lawlessness, respect for law, for a time at least, was gone. Certain members of society there were who felt themselves to be above the law of man. Innumerable sectaries sprang up confusing religious freedom with civil license. True, the Friends never went so far in this respect by any means as did the Levellers, Diggers, Ranters, and Fifth Monarchy Men. Yet they found it difficult to be subject to any earthly power, as is evident from Fox's own statement quoted above.

William Penn in establishing his proprietorship in America set forth his philosophy of government in terms never surpassed for insight or brevity. "Any government," he declared, "is free to the people under it (whatever be its frame) where the laws rule and the people are a party to those laws; and more than this is tyranny, oligarchy, or confusion. . . . Liberty without obedience is confusion, and obedience without liberty is slavery." But that even this was not sufficiently liberal and that Penn had difficulty in enforcing submission to duly elected authority is discovered in a letter he wrote the colony: "For the love of God, me, and the poor country be not so governmentish, so noisy and open in your dissatisfactions."

What then has been the national heritage from these representative sections of our colonial territory? It will be found, we believe, that each colony has contributed its own peculiar gift to this spiritual entity we call Americanism, and to each the nation of today owes a debt of gratitude.

From Virginia there has passed into American life the full flower of English culture. It is a culture which rises from the proud knowledge of a right possessed by virtue of birth within the domain of English law. It is the possession of those born within the confines of an embattled island whose people, protected from foreign invasion by the provisions of nature, were free to work out their own destiny without let or hindrance from others. A little nation, a small family of kindred stock, was compelled through the years to recognize the mutual worth of its individual members, and all of them were made aware of the richness of their common privileges and traditions. Such prerogatives and national consciousness came not without a struggle. There was Magna Carta, the slow rise of the House of Commons with its long battle against absolute monarchy, the Petition of Right.

All this was transferred to Virginia. It is worthy of memory that it is this State that gave America her first Bill of Rights. It was she who provided the statesmen who gave this nation lawful birth, established its

Constitution during its infancy, and guided it through the years of its early development. Later, in the War between the States, Virginia entered that war not to protect or defend slavery, but to protect State rights.

That spirit and attitude has been carried into personal relationships. There is to be found among Virginians, more universally and to a higher degree than perhaps elsewhere in the nation, a sense of the worth and dignity of the person of another and of his inherent right to direct his own concerns without interference on the part of his fellows. The Virginian is a gentleman of moderation and restraint who, conscious of his own inner hopes and desires, abilities and integrity, expects every other man to have similar estimates of himself, and therefore never attempts to impose himself, his views, and methods upon another. Virginia has taught America moderation and tolerance, a respect for personality that expresses the Englishman's traditional conception of "playing cricket."

True, that attitude may have bred a cautiousness that borders on conservatism, a contentedness with things as they are that has resulted in a non-progressiveness in certain social conditions. Nevertheless it has provided America with a balance and maturity in political philosophy and self-government which has enforced the principle that true democracy is possible only within a free, self-respecting, enlightened citizenry obedient to its own duly enacted law.

From Rhode Island and South Carolina has come a slight advance upon this position. Their political philosophy, of middle-seventeenth-century England, assumes that the rights of men are not privileges and prerogatives established and conferred by society upon its own members but that they are inalienable. Consequently individualism has been the cultural characteristic generally attributed as our heritages from these colonies. If Virginia has been inclined toward cautiousness in the revision of social institutions and practices, these have inclined toward extremes in revolution. In early colonial days Rhode Island was accused of being a veritable cesspool of iniquity where every man was a law unto himself. It is said that the first antislavery society in America was organized in 1775 on the porch of the home of the Reverend Samuel Hopkins, Congregational minister in Newport. This State refused to send representatives to the Constitutional Convention of 1787 and delayed ratification of the Federal Constitution, fearing lest the provisions of that document might be found to restrict the liberties of individual citizens.

Claiming this right of revolution, South Carolina led the Southern States in secession by her Ordinance of 1860: "We, the people of the State of South Carolina, in convention assembled, do declare and ordain

. . . that the Union now subsisting between South Carolina and other States under the name of 'The United States of America' is hereby dissolved." It was an assertion of popular rights, insisting upon the logical conclusion that if government is derived from the people and rests upon the consent of the governed then the people who make the laws and enter into agreements may also abolish and dissolve them. It was the positive affirmation of the doctrine of Roger Williams: "Kings and Magistrates must be considered (as formerly) invested with no more power than the people betrust them with." And again: ". . . in every free State civill Magistrates have no more power but what the peoples of those States, Lands, and Countries betrust them with. . . ."

A further illustration of the kinship of these two States in this respect is found in certain events within the history of the Baptist denomination. In the perplexing days preceding the Civil War when Baptists of the North and South were drifting toward division over the question of slavery, Dr. Francis Wayland, president of Brown University, and Dr. Richard Fuller, of South Carolina, carried on a public correspondence in a fraternal, amicable spirit in the hope that by mutual understanding denominational discord might be avoided and coöperative union maintained.

A corollary from the principle of individual freedom is the right of adventure and experimentation. Indeed the founding of Rhode Island on the avowed assurance of separation of church and state—denying external authority in religion, while pledging submission to it in civil affairs—was a daring, if not a mad, experiment, condemned in its day as impossible of permanent security. It is also not without significance to recall that Rhode Island College, now Brown University, was the first institution of higher education in America which required no creedal statement of faculty or students. Free of all intellectual restraints, Brown has been a pioneer in certain educational methods. President Wayland's "Report to the Corporation of Brown University" in 1850 advocated the election of studies and emphasized scientific training, a policy pursued by other American colleges since that time.

A somewhat similar pioneer spirit for the Southern States is found in the educational interests of South Carolina arising in the middle of the eighteenth century and in the fact that this State was the first in which Baptists of America organized a denominational State Convention.

Our heritage from Massachusetts is the corporation or social compact. This colony, as no other, was founded as a corporation. Shortly after the charter was granted by Charles I creating a corporation with the title, The Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay in New

England, the company decided to transfer its seat of government and charter to America. Thus a body of men under charter as a trade corporation became a self-governing commonwealth or body politic.

It must ever be remembered, however, that the purpose of founding the corporation and colony was religious. Among these Puritans, moreover, the covenant or compact was held sacred and holy. God had entered into relationship with men through covenants. Thus all human society was organized in its various forms by the compact which was to be held inviolate. When in 1634 Thomas Hooker and his congregation from Newtown sought permission to move to the Connecticut Valley, he was restrained by the other ministers of the Bay on the ground that in doing so he would prove unfaithful to his covenant pledging loyalty to the corporation. His going would, as it were, leave a breach in the wall of the stockade.

The unit of the colony was the town, the centre of whose life was the church, the right of franchise being based upon church membership. As the church was organized by the members covenanting together, the town may be thought of as a religious community, the citizens of which were bound together by this sacred bond. All affairs pertaining to the welfare of the community were considered by the freemen in the town meeting. The colony therefore became a group of self-governing towns, subject in a degree to the General Court but free to regulate their own internal concerns. The town was a community or fellowship of like-minded folk of kindred interests and purposes, united by an oath of mutual allegiance, the sacred covenant of divine origin.

Inasmuch as the foundation of Massachusetts was fundamentally religion, the gift of this colony to the nation has been a public conscience, a sense of social obligations and mutual responsibilities. From her, and through Connecticut from her, has come the Constitution, the recognition of the mutuality of life, the unity of society. The good of each is bound up with the good of all.

It is not primarily the freedom of the individual that is guaranteed but the security of the community in which and by which alone the individual may enjoy his rights and privileges. In the safety and welfare of the civil body the individual citizen loses and finds himself. America has inherited from this Bay colony the corporation with its binding agreements before the law; the incorporated town with its legal authority to enforce common support of community enterprise; the public school system and all welfare agencies enjoining corporate maintenance; the responsibility of public officials to the electorate.

It is true such authority may become autocratic and the means of enforcement and attainment so systematized and institutionalized as to

become sacred and therefore static and even reactionary. The community—associated with the perpetuation of its traditional customs, methods, and institutions—may be considered more worthy of attention than are the conditions and needs of people. Society must always guard itself against the insinuating belief, dangerously destructive of human values, that man was made for the Sabbath. Between the extremes of rugged individualism and the autocracy of the divinely elected few the doctrine of corporate responsibility must take its course.

Nor has the nation wholly escaped the danger. Rugged individualism by its very success has claimed for itself divine appointment and approbation. On the other hand, an almost fetish-like devotion to the Constitution has many times defeated legislation calculated to cure a social evil and relieve a gross injustice such as child labor.

Pennsylvania's bequest has not been altogether enviable. The doctrine of the Inner Light, the distinctive teaching of the Friends, has led in two directions in social thought and action. One has been most beneficial, the other not so and perhaps positively detrimental.

The doctrine is an extension of the principle of the sacredness of personality. It may be said to be a definition of it and an emphasis upon it. The assertion of this teaching is something more than the declaration of individual rights, whether religious or political. It is the affirmation of an essential quality—the divinity of man. Humanity has been created in the likeness of God. Each human being, by virtue of being human, is indwelt of God. There is a holiness or potential holiness of each and of all because of this unity original in creation. Humanity always bears within itself this essence of divinity.

Thus within Pennsylvania's history there stands revealed the Quaker's protest against all that has been destructive of human worth and the enjoyment of life's opportunities. The initial protest against slavery issued from the Friends of Germantown, Pennsylvania, in 1688. Although some Quakers continued to own slaves as did William Penn, yet by the end of that century the Philadelphia Yearly Meeting urged Quakers "not to encourage the bringing in of any more negroes." The effort of the Friends to abolish the system and their care of the fugitive slave is well known. Pennsylvania was noted for its many stations on the underground railway. Quakers have always had a high regard for the equality of all men whatever their color or race. By legislation Pennsylvania endeavored to protect the child and the helpless. Orphan courts were erected in the first years of the colony's history, and provision made for the destitute, old as well as young. The pacifism of this religious body, or perhaps more truly, their doctrine of non-violence, is also known to be a cardinal principle of their beliefs.

It is this that leads to a recognition of the other development of the doctrine of the Inner Light. The fact is that the Quaker's emphasis upon this teaching has robbed him of ability and necessity of government. How could one who is certain of this direct, personal guidance of the Almighty submit to the authority of man or men? Each person has free access to the knowledge and will of God, of what is right and wrong, and may wait for the direction of his Spirit—whether in questions of duties, moral obligations, economic pursuits, or political policies. Quakerism is pure democracy by which in general meetings problems are thought out together and discussed without the appointment of a chairman or moderator, certainly without the election of a governor.

Historically, therefore, the Quaker's doctrine not only unfits him for participation in government but it protests against government. He has not only refused to offer any special respect to the officer of government, as we have already seen, but has at times refused to acknowledge the external authority of government itself.

When then the Quakers in Pennsylvania entered upon their "Experiment in Government" they made a failure of it. Their religious scruples incapacitated them for dealing with the realities of state government. Safe and secure in the long-established society of old England, they might insist upon their right not to bear arms. But in the new, frontier lands of America that policy simply could not be maintained, provided Pennsylvania, or a Quaker social order, was to be made safe and secure for posterity. The French and their Indian allies had little regard for the pacific proclamations of the Friends—except to hope they would adhere to them. But the Quaker did not. In the Provincial Assembly his political unscrupulosity triumphed over his religious scrupulosity, and those worthy virtues of Quakerism, to which every honest man must pay tribute, were forever lost to the legislative halls of Pennsylvania.

The entire blame may not rest upon the Friends. The pietist groups, so numerous in the early colony and later state, even more than the Quakers, refused to take active part in the affairs of government. The Baptists who came into the Philadelphia area almost immediately upon the erection of the proprietorship, and whose strength for years centred in that section, have ever insisted upon the separation of church and state. That doctrine has been misinterpreted even by its original teachers. If the state has no voice in the affairs of the church, then, said the state, the church has no voice in the affairs of state. So it has been acknowledged. The gospel of individual salvation has triumphed over the true gospel of the salvation of society, the world. And Pennsylvania through the years has had the unenviable reputation of being one of the most corrupt States politically in the Union.

This is America. Into the woof and web of her character has been woven the cultural threads of many peoples and races. But the pattern has been set by these strands of colonial Anglo-Saxon fashioning. The design has been wrought upon the wide, variegated background of mountains and plains, lakes and rives, climate and soil. Yet the product is a unit, clearly and strongly drawn. The threads have been woven together by the toil of the pioneers, the vision of statesmen of church and state, the faith of poets, dreamers, and empire builders, the sacrifices passionate and terrifying, of internecine war, and the dedication, deliberate and unyielding, in these latter days of body, mind, and spirit to the defense and perpetuation of that heritage wherever threatened throughout the world.

IMAGES OF YAHWEH

WILLIAM A. IRWIN

University of Chicago

THIS TOPIC has become in recent years a contentious issue. Formerly it was generally agreed that Israel, just as their pagan neighbors, worshipped their God in physical, presumably anthropomorphic, form.[1] But the contrary opinion is now advanced by some, with considerable emphasis, and the issue has become one of the disputed problems of current Old Testament study. Gressmann's study of the sacred ark has had considerable influence upon subsequent investigation. He came to the conclusion that the ark was in original intent a movable shrine for use in processions, like those of Egypt. But a religious procession presupposes some visible representation of the god's presence. This, he believed, was indicated by the biblical word, *ephod,* which was to be understood in this connection as meaning an image. Specifically, Gressmann held that underneath the outspread wings of the cherubim on the ark there was an image of Yahweh in the form of a bull.[2] The view of Budde,[3] closely related, concluded that wherever *ephod* indicates some solid object it is a surrogate for *'abbir* (bull), and thus serves to obscure the fact that originally these passages mentioned a bull-image of Yahweh. Similar was the position of Mowinckel who adopted Gressmann's conclusions with cordial approval. His attitude to the question is indicated by the form of his title, implying as it does, not uncertainty as to the existence of Yahweh images, but only as to the date when they were abandoned.[4] Recently, T. J. Meek has also expressed briefly his conviction that Yahweh images existed, citing primarily the significance of the legal prohibitions.[5]

The contrary opinion has been advocated by Pfeiffer,[6] Obbink[7] Galling,[8] Hempel,[9] and Albright.[10] The first of these, while discussing

[1] See, for example, H. P. Smith, *Religion of Israel,* p. 66; H. W. Robinson, *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament,* pp. 62 f.; Oesterley, *Evolution of Old Testament Religion,* pp. 67 f.; Peters, *Religion of the Hebrews,* p. 104; Knudtson, *Religious Teaching of the Old Testament,* pp. 101, 109 ff.; Oesterley and Robinson, *Hebrew Religion,* pp. 145 f.; Schmidt, "Mose und der Dekalog," *Eucharisterion,* p. 97.

[2] *Die Lade Yahves* (1920); see in particular p. 68.

[3] "Ephod und Lade," in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,* XXXIX (1921), pp. 36 ff.

[4] "Wann wurde der Jahwäkultus in Jerusalem offiziel bildlos?" in *Acta Orientalia,* VIII (1930), pp. 257-259.

[5] *Journal of Biblical Literature,* LXI (1942), p. 33.

[6] "Images of Yahweh," in *Journal of Biblical Literature,* XLV (1926), pp. 211-222.

[7] "Jahwebilder," in *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentiche Wissenschaft,* XLVII (1929), pp. 264-274.

[8] *Biblisches Reallexicon,* articles, "Götterbild, mannliches," and "Kultgerät" (1935).

[9] *Gott und Mensch,* 2te Aufl. (1936), pp. 264 ff.

[10] *From the Stone Age to Christianity* (1940), pp. 202 f., 229 f.

the evidence frequently with too great brevity, surveyed somewhat fully the outlines of the problem. He spoke of the evidence in the Pentateuchal laws, of Micah's image, of the ephod, the teraphim, the brazen serpent, the bulls of Jeroboam's rebel cult, and finally of the general probabilities of the case. Obhink's major contribution was the view that the bulls of Jeroboam were empty pedestals for the invisible presence of Yahweh. And it is this idea that has seized the imagination of the later writers, and along with some stress upon the original aniconic character of Yahwism may be considered the centre, if not the chief basis, of their position. Hempel, indeed, goes the length of tracing four stages in the development of this thought: 1. A god in bull form; 2. an anthropomorphic figure standing on a bull; 3. a bull with a god symbol superimposed; and 4. the bull as an "empty throne of God." It is an appealing reconstruction, but even the great name of Hempel cannot carry it to conviction unless there is adequate supporting evidence. Galling is more cautious. He admits the existence of sacred cult objects—ephod, teraphim, and the figures in the *debir* of the temple—but questions whether these were actually representations of the deity. Further, he holds that the Hebrews took over images as cult objects from the Canaanites, as is evidenced by the legal prohibitions. He weighs judicially the case for the "bull-images" as pedestals for invisible figures of the deity, and comes to the conclusion that the intensity of feeling in Exod. 32 and Hos. 13:2 would be unintelligible on the grounds that the Israelites had merely made a pedestal, or throne, for their God. However, he denies Gressmann's claim of bull-images of Yahweh, while admitting that we must recognize the existence of actual bull-gods among the people.

It is along these lines that the problem must be approached; for archæology has not yet provided us with an image of Yahweh,[11] at least not such as we have recognized. This deficiency must not, however, be invoked as adverse evidence, for no informed person would for a moment suppose that we have gathered all the surprises stored for our wonder in the Palestinian hills. Yet, archæological testimony is, even now, not irrelevant.

Gideon's "ephod,"[12] Micah's image,[13] and the "golden calves"[14] are certainly the features of Old Testament story which one must first fasten upon as most obviously related to our problem. In regard to the first, our interest is quickened by Pfeiffer's admission that "if the word ephod, where it is used for a sacred object placed conspicuously in a sanctuary,

[11] The famous coin from Gaza will scarcely be invoked as an exception; Battersby Harford, *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel*, frontispiece.

[12] Judg. 8: 24-27.

[13] Judg. 17: 4 ff.

[14] Exod. 32; I Kings 12: 28 f.

signifies an idol, there is no reason to doubt that it was an image of Yahweh." If then this condition may be met, it would seem that one of the protagonists of the aniconic worship of Yahweh would, by his own confession, have failed of his purpose. Further, the Gideon story is attractive, since, insofar as we may trust the narrative, the evidence is unequivocal that Gideon was a devout Yahwist. And it was as an expression of this piety that he made his "ephod." It seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that this mysterious object was made in order to take a prominent place in the Yahweh cult. However, for Pfeiffer the matter is so simple that he does not treat this incident at all. But presumably his thought is to invoke, as he does for the Micah story, the view of Arnold, that " 'the reading *ephod,* wherever in the Old Testament it stands for a solid object, has been deliberately substituted by Jewish scribes for a more troublesome word,' namely *'aron* (ark)." But while admitting freely the worth of Arnold's conclusion, perhaps to the extent of agreeing with Pfeiffer that "one wonders at the reluctance of some critics to adopt it,"[15] yet surely there is something wrong when it is applied to Gideon's "ephod." It is odd that he should have used seventeen hundred shekels of gold in making a box. Even if we suppose that the box was overlaid with gold, like that of the priestly prescriptions,[16] uncertainties are not allayed. And what was the purpose of the "purple garments" freely given and received, and then used in the making of this "ephod"? Such have no relation to an ornate box; not even the priestly "ark" found occasion for royal drapings. And further, the sequel renders this line of interpretation impossible. The writer would never have used the verb *zanah*[17] of a practice so innocent as the cult of the Yahweh-box.

Pfeiffer is quite correct that the ephod was "a priestly garment," but it was a garment of gods as well.[18] Then, by a transfer of thought familiar in the history of religions, it came to indicate the divine wearer of the ephod. Arnold's results must be revised to the extent of recognizing that sometimes the Old Testament ephod, "where it stands for a solid object," is not a surrogate at all, but a well-known and quite intelligible term for a divine figure. Gideon's ephod was an ornate image made in considerable measure of gold. It was decked with royal garments; hence was apparently an anthropomorphic image. That it was of Yahweh is evident.

The approach to the problem of Micah's image is similar. Micah

[15] *Op. cit.,* p. 214.
[16] Exod. 25: 10-22.
[17] "To play the harlot"; used commonly in the historical books for idolatrous worship.
[18] Thiersch, *Ependytes und Ephod; Gottesbild und Priesterkleid in alten Vorderasien* (1936).

bore a Yahwistic name. His mother invoked Yahweh in blessing. The shrine was clearly intended for Yahweh, for Micah congratulated himself on hiring the Levite, "Now I know that Yahweh will do me good." Further, the divine oracle by the priest was given in the name of Yahweh.[19] There is no basis for doubt that the story relates to a Yahwistic group and a shrine of Yahweh. But the clear purport of the story has been evaded through critical questions about the meaning, indeed the genuineness, of the description of the image. It is called several times (in our common translation) "a graven image and a molten image"; further, ephod and teraphim are mentioned in Judg. 18:14, 17. Now on the face of it this looks like two images, if not indeed four, as Obhink believes.[20] Pfeiffer dismisses the entire matter with the cavalier observation that "Professor Arnold proved convincingly that it [*sc.* 17:2-4] is a marginal interpolation. Any attempt to base an argument on the historicity of this narrative can be classed with the labors of Sisyphus."[21] But this is palpable evasion of the evidence. Even if these verses are as spurious as Pfeiffer would believe, the cult objects are inextricably in the story.

However, let us undertake joyfully the allotted "labor of Sisyphus." Judg. 17:2-4 may or may not be spurious; but it is not corrupt. Nor does it relate the making of two images of Yahweh, as Obhink would caricature the account, but only one. And the phrase, *"pesel umassekah"* ("graven image and molten image") means just that! We have in the museum of the Oriental Institute a small seated metal figure of some god, found at Megiddo in the season 1935-36.[22] It is of cast bronze, hence a *massekah.* But it has a sheathing of gold, except where one foot is broken off and part of the gold with it, revealing the inner structure. In external appearance it is a "pesel"—a "graven image." The figure, then, is at once both "a graven image and a molten image"; it is a *"pesel umassekah."* Such, obviously, is the meaning of Judg. 17:2-4. The phrase *"pesel umassekah"* is a hendiadys. Critical questions disappear as baseless. Nor may we confuse the issue, as does Obhink, with the ephod and teraphim. "Ephod" is obviously not a surrogate here, but is to be understood in its original sense as the official dress of the priest. The nature of the teraphim is still too uncertain for us to spend time over it. But apart from that, the story fulfills Pfeiffer's demand for a worshipper of Yahweh alone who employed an image.

The argument is based on the assumption that the stories of both

[19] Judg. 18:6.

[20] *Op. cit.,* p. 271. It is interesting that he admits he does not know what relation they had to the Yahweh cult.

[21] *Op. cit.,* p. 213.

[22] See *Illustrated London News,* June 20, 1936, pp. 1108 f.

Gideon and Micah are in considerable measure reliable. But if instead we concede that their features which reveal the use of Yahweh images are late intrusions and totally unhistorical, this will but strengthen the case. For if some writer in a later period, when obviously the conscience against image worship had become keen, inserted these embellishments of the stories, clearly he could have done so, not on theological presumptions, but only on the grounds that he knew such features to have been characteristic of the age of the judges. Whichever way we take them, these aspects of the Gideon and Micah stories are incontrovertible evidence, not alone that images of Yahweh were made, but that they were sufficiently familiar paraphernalia of his shrines to excite no remark.

The bulls of Jeroboam, we commented, are of central importance in the recent crusade for the aniconic character of the Yahweh cult. We have seen the importance of Obhink's article for the prevalence of the notion that they were empty pedestals for an invisible figure of Yahweh. But Obhink's arguments are not impressive. He does nothing but allege an analogy to and dependence upon contemporary representations of "Hadad-Ramman" standing upon a bull. Yet Jeroboam, so the reasoning goes, would not take over the anthropomorphic figure of the god, but constructed a pedestal in the form of a bull, and left the place for Yahweh empty. Now, surely it is apparent that this is not reasoning at all but sheer unrestrained guessing, dictated apparently by Obhink's personal predilections. Since Hempel makes no attempt to argue the case, and Galling, as we have seen, gives it only a respectful hearing, the presentation by Albright is the classic formulation of the evidence. He says,

> In presumable reaction against the representation of Yahweh in the Temple of Solomon as an invisible deity enthroned above the two cherubim (winged sphinxes), which is now known to have been influenced by contemporary iconography (where kings and gods are shown sitting on thrones supported by two cherubs), Jeroboam represented Yahweh as an invisible figure standing on a young bull of gold.

Then after an interval in which he refers to Obhink's view, he proceeds,

> In 1938 the present writer showed that no other interpretation can be squared with the known facts. The storm-god of Mesopotamia is actually represented on seal-cylinders of the second millenium B.C. as a schematic bolt of lightning set upright on the back of a bull. . . . We may safely assume in the light of the conflate tradition preserved in Ex. 32, which probably has a very early nucleus, that the pre-Mosaic Hebrews had also been accustomed to thinking of their chief god, the storm-god Shaddai, as standing on a bull, and the pre-Israelite Hebrews of central Palestine almost certainly shared ideas of this kind with their Canaanite neighbors, who portrayed Baal in the same way.[23]

[23] *Op. cit.*, pp. 229 f.

However, it is distressing to note that in large measure this is pure imagination, just as truly as Obhink's position. At the outset it begs the question with its assumption that in Solomon's temple there was some sort of representation of Yahweh as an invisible deity enthroned above the cherubim. This is not a weighing of evidence, but merely *ex parte* use of it; for when we turn back a few pages to Albright's account of the reign of Solomon, we find once more assertion instead of evidence and argument. And what "safety" is there in "assuming" that the story in Exod. 32 testifies to the cult of Shaddai standing on a bull, or that "the pre-Israelite Hebrews" shared ideas of this kind with their Canaanite neighbors"?

And so "no other interpretation" but that of Albright and Obhink "can be squared with the known facts"? Indeed! And those alleged facts —the only relevant facts that Albright adduces—are that "the storm-god of Mesopotamia is actually represented on seal-cylinders . . . as a schematic bolt of lightning set upright on the back of a bull." But this is less fact than interpretation, and completely unsound interpretation. Seals of the sort to which Albright refers[24] show a variety of relationships of the god, the bull, and the lightning. It is quite true that the lightning on the back of the bull occurs in a small percentage of cases. Sometimes, however, it has a pedestal, suggesting that it is not *on* but *over* the bull.[25] Frequently bull and lightning are separate, and both apart from the god. Commonly the god holds the lightning in his hand; in some of these cases he is either standing on the bull's back or in the act of mounting. But in the great majority of cases, save the few examples that have exclusively or mainly a group of divine symbols,[26] the god is represented as well as the lightning. Under these circumstances, it is totally out of the question to invoke these lightning symbols as representations of a god who is not present, much less of an invisible god. On the contrary, this normal association of god and lightning shows the common understanding was that the lightning (and bull) were symbols, not of the god but, as Galling properly observes,[27] of his attributes. But too, the diverse

[24] Frankfort, *Cylinder Seals* (1939), Pl. xxvi k; xxvii f, l; xxix f; Von Der Osten, *Ancient Oriental Seals in the Collection of Mr. Edward T. Newell* (*OIP* xxii, 1934), Pl. xv 184; *id., Ancient Oriental Seals in the Collection of Mrs. Agnes Baldwin Brett* (*OIP* xxxvii, 1936) Pl. vii, 70, 71; Eisen, *Ancient Oriental and other Seals with a description of the Collection of Mrs. William H. Moore* (*OIP* xlvii, 1940), Pl. vii 62, 63; Delaporte, *Catalogue des Cylindres Orientaux,* (1920-23) A345, A382, A400, A413, A436, A449, A458, A467, A484, A517a, A556, A558b, A568, A571b, A576, A578, A590, A595a; *id., Catalogue des Cylindres Orientaux . . . de la Bibliotheque Nationale* (1910), Pl. xii 148, xv 204, xviii 255; *id., Catalogue du Musée Guimet, Cylindres Orientaux* (1909) 81, 82, 83, 84. Legrain, *The Culture of the Babylonians from their Seals in the Collection of the Museum* (1925), 63, 240, 326, 367, 370, 372, 376, 412, 415, 424, 434, 435, 445, 453, 455, 456, 457, 458, 459, 470, 480, 491, 501, 702, 706, 707; Moortgat, *Vorderasiatische Rollsiegel* (1940), 300, 351, 352, 353, 362, 399, 400, 402, 403, 422, 431, 432, 444, 449, 459, 496, 497, 516, 680, 681. Cf. Ward, *Seal Cylinders of Western Asia* (1910), p. 399.

[25] A clear case is Legrain, *op. cit.,* 372.

[26] *E.g.,* Legrain, *op. cit.,* 63, 706, 706.

[27] *Op. cit.,* p. 204. On this question see further Jacobsthal, *Der Blitz in der orientalischen und griechischen Kunst;* Schlobies, *Der akkadische Wettergott in Mesopotamien.*

relations of lightning and bull indicate clearly that the underlying concept is much more complex than would be suggested by Albright's facile assumption that the bull is present to serve as a pedestal for the lightning, or indeed for the god himself.

However, since in some cases the symbol appears without the god, it would seem that for some elements of ancient thought it came to stand in some way as representative of the god himself. But if Albright should invoke this as vindication of his view, then he must accept as well all the symbols on the boundary stones as evidence of aniconic worship. Obviously, he will not support this absurdity; yet where is he to stop short of this, while still holding to his cherished theory?

But finally, let us suppose that his account of these seals were accurate: suppose that they always represented the god, not in anthropomorphic form but as "a schematic bolt of lightning set upright on the back of a bull"—then what of it? Between this and an invisible Yahweh standing on a bull pedestal there is a gulf so wide as to defy the logic of most of us. The "schematic bolt of lightning" is still visible and iconic. In other words, the fourth step in the development sketched by Hempel is pure assumption. Neither he, nor Obhink, nor Albright has advanced a particle of evidence that it was ever taken. There is in the whole body of this alleged evidence not the least basis for postulating an ancient concept of an invisible god upon a visible pedestal. Albright's case collapses completely.

Then what of Jeroboam's bulls? We can only say that if they were anything other than objects of worship, specifically figures of gods, then we lack all evidence of such a situation. We can only treat them, as they were regarded until the rise of Obhink's theory, as images which Jeroboam encouraged his people to worship. Whether or not they represented a reversal to an ancient bull-cult, as Meek believes,[28] or were from the first symbols of the Yahweh religion, as is commonly held, certainly they had become this latter by the time of Amos and Hosea. The view which cites them as evidence for the existence of Yahweh images is then correct for this period at least.

The problem of the sacred ark has advanced somewhat since the discussions by Arnold, Budde, Gressmann, and Schmidt. Archæological finds and specifically the study by H. G. May[29] shows that we are to look for its relationships, not primarily to Egypt, relevant as such parallels yet remain, but to Canaan. That this Canaanite shrine served the purpose of the housing and transport of the god in the form of a diminutive image there can be no doubt. But the central question posed by the

[28] *Hebrew Origins* (1936), pp. 159 ff.

[29] "The Ark a Miniature Temple," in *American Journal of Semitic Languages* (1936), pp. 215-234.

exponents of the spirituality of Israel's earliest religion is similar to that which we have discussed relevant to Jeroboam's bulls. When Israel adopted this usage, did they employ a similar small image to represent the presence of their God in his house, or was he there only as an invisible presence?

Now, that Israel's religion attained such spirituality is evident beyond any need of debate; further, this level was reached before the close of Old Testament times. It may even be, as Schmidt claims,[30] that in the temple in Jerusalem at some period there stood an empty throne of Yahweh. The question then is whether such high level was characteristic of Yahwism through the early period from the first moment when we have resources to study it. But surely it is pedantic to delay now over an answer. Since images of Yahweh were in not uncommon use, what grounds have we to postulate that this box, redolent of pagan practice and association, should peculiarly express a spirituality that the religion had not otherwise approached? Our findings just now in regard to the bulls of Bethel and Dan are likewise ruinous to such a theory. But the theory of the empty bull-pedestals has its counterpart in one claiming that the ark was originally an empty throne of Yahweh; and support for this is sought in the discovery of certain divine thrones, but lacking an image.[31] But obviously this is as baseless as the use of archæology to support the theory of any empty pedestal. Divine figures in seated posture but devoid of a seat are well-known.[32] Are we then to reverse the argument and claim that ancient worship, though iconic, yet clung to the idea of an invisible throne of the god? Obviously, the whole matter is absurd. All that the evidence indicates is that seat and seated figure have become separated by the accident of the centuries.

Yet there are two biblical incidents which provide evidence more definite than these implications. What was it that prompted the men of Beth Shemesh to look into the ark when it arrived back from Philistia?[33] It could have been nothing else than an anxiety as to whether its contents had come home unmolested. And it is unnecessary to comment that these certainly were not the pot of manna and the rest of the paraphernalia supplied by sacerdotal mythology of a later age. But it is consonant with all the available evidence to hold that the men of Beth Shemesh were concerned for the safety of Yahweh himself, specifically for his image.

And this conjecture receives support from the next incident in which this box figures, the occasion of David's interrupted attempt to

[30] Hans Schmidt, "Kerubenthron und Lade," *Eucharisterion* (1923), pp. 132 ff.

[31] Cf. Galling, *Biblisches Reallexicon,* article "Kultgerät"; however, Galling is doubtful of the view.

[32] See Galling, *op. cit.,* p. 218; we have several in the Oriental Institute.

[33] I Sam. 6: 19.

bring it to Jerusalem.[34] Uzzah touched the ark because "the oxen threw it (or him) down."[35] Now what did they throw down? The ark? Possibly; yet a box is reasonably stable, and would probably remain on its base through the jolting of a cart. Certainly if we are to picture this ancient ark in a form comparable with that of the priestly construction, it is difficult to see how it could readily be overthrown by the movement of the cart; though if it was of dimensions closely similar to the clay shrines mentioned above, it would be less secure. But still the entire incident, in the light of Oriental parallels, strongly suggests that on this formal procession of the god into his appointed place, his image stood in full view before his boisterous worshippers. It was Yahweh himself that the oxen threw down.

There can be no doubt that the legal prohibitions of image making demonstrate the existence of this practice. But uncertainty must arise as to whether the legislators spoke of actual Yahweh images, or of the danger of carrying over image making from the pagan cults. It might be claimed that this is the purport of Deut. 12:4, which follows a catalogue of idolatrous paraphernalia with the injunction, "Ye shall not do so to Yahweh your God." Still, one must feel that the earnestness of the legislator indicates some closer touch with the evil than such mere conjecture. Yet, however this may be, we can agree with Obhink that the second commandment is not aimed at Yahweh images. But the entire problem takes a definite complexion from the matters we have surveyed hitherto. There can remain no doubt that the laws against images are in specific cases concerned with Yahweh images. It is unnecessary to examine all these passages. One alone deserves notice, since its implication has been commonly overlooked. This is Exod. 20:23, which the *American Standard* renders, "Ye shall not make *other gods* with me; gods of silver, or gods of gold, ye shall not make unto you." The italics indicate the actual situation that the words "other gods" have been inserted by the translators; they have no equivalent in the Hebrew. The presence of some difficulty is further evidenced by the *American Translation* (Chicago); it omits all the first part of the verse, and reads simply, "Gods of silver and gods of gold you must not make for yourselves." But whatever problem may inhere in the passage belongs to the pointing and punctuation alone. The consonantal text is clear, straightforward, and lucid. There is not a single reason to question its accuracy. And it says without qualification, "You shall not make me into silver

[34] II Sam. 6:1-8.

[35] Apparently we are so to translate the phrase *shmatu habbaqar*. Some critics prefer to emend the verb to *shmato;* but MT amounts in the end to the same thing, for an object must be understood. To *throw down* or *let down* is the invariable meaning of this verb.

gods; gods of gold you shall not make for yourselves."[36] The parallelism of the verse shows that the golden gods were likewise figures of Yahweh. The law might almost be considered a commentary on the Gideon and Micah stories. At least it provides a concurrence of testimony which leaves no uncertainty.

However, it was noted above that Pfeiffer invokes general considerations in support of his view. He says, "If Yahweh was never pictured in any physical form, the process leading to monotheism and the instinctive horror of Judaism for all idols becomes intelligible." It is a remarkable claim; but it scarcely calls for further comment than that it is an obvious *reductio ad absurdum*. Instead, the evidence points to a period in Israel's history when its worship of Yahweh was to all intents indistinguishable from current paganism; from this it rose by steps that we can trace—whether or not we can understand—to the exalted insights revealed in the best of the Old Testament.

[36] The construction of a verb of making with two accusatives is so normal as to call for no comment. Also the erroneous punctuation of the verse is not without parallel. It seems probable that the strange pointing and punctuation are a sort of *tiqqun sopherim;* by this simple device the scribes succeeded in evading the irreverence of speaking of Yahweh's having been made into an image.

MUSIC AND MORES

HARMON M. GEHR

Church of the Restoration, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

In reading any history of art one is struck with certain parallels to general human development—with the coming of foresight, with the development of manual ingenuity, with standards of evaluation, with the religious sense. One generalizes at once that the history of art is the history of civilization.

But does not that limit an understanding of civilization? Is the history of art great enough to include all the aspects of "community living," which is an accepted sociological definition of civilization? I doubt it.

Yet I am intrigued by the correlation of the development of one art—music—with certain areas of human history. In presenting a few of these parallels it is with no intent to identify them or to spin any theories from resemblance.

That music and civilization are closely associated is evident from investigations that have disclosed ways for making varied and greater sounds, as dating from earliest recorded times. Examples of the harp, flute, drum, trumpet, and cymbal have been recovered from Egyptian tombs. The harp, in particular, is modern in appearance. Another instrument, the sistrum, a series of small disks on strings, is still in use in Ethiopia.

The first instruments man devised were doubtless of the pitchless percussion type—tom-tom, timbrel, triangle, cymbal, gong, rattle, castanets. (All are still to be seen in the modern dance band!) Probably they were the earliest because rhythm—in running water, the storm, bird calls, echoes—was a common experience. Perhaps the regularity of walking, running, or swimming, caused early man to seek rhythm as an end in itself and led him to make it a part of his æsthetic enjoyment in percussion music and the dance.

Sound is the most direct way of expressing the emotions. All who have children know this! Some ornithologists explain the singing of birds as an expression of dominance. So a song sparrow will take his position in the same place at the same time day after day and issue a musical challenge to all other song sparrows. In a similar way the beginnings of vocal or instrumental music might be explained. There can be no question that music is an auditory method of expressing emotion—and a quite Freudian interpretation could be made of its origin.

Then it was discovered that a variety of sounds could be made.

Pitch, quality, and volume were elements to be considered. Pan cut a reed by the river and he also blew on a conch shell where the waves rolled in. He tested a blade of grass and he listened to the twang of the taut bowstring. Different kinds of wind and string instruments came about.

The description of biblical music makes it seem almost contemporary:

> Praise [God] with a bugle blast,
> Praise him with lute and lyre,
> Praise him with the drum and dance,
> Praise him with strings and flute,
> Praise him with resounding cymbals,
> Praise him with the clash of cymbals.
> Let everything that breathes, praise the Eternal!
> Hallelujah![1]

Bugles, cymbals, flutes, drums, and strings we still have. It is doubtful, however, if western ears would find the temple music more beautiful or devotional than the typical overdressed drum and bugle corps. There is a tradition that plainsong began with the chants in Solomon's temple. Even if this were true, minds that have been attuned to harmony, melody, and the rhythm patterns of the west are not reminded by plain song of anything in their own experience.

This raises the difficult question: What constitutes music? The Greeks, for example, made it include reading, writing, mathematics, and the literary arts. There is nothing to prove that they mastered the simplest rudiments of music as we know it. A radio address by Deems Taylor, last winter, pictured the unfortunate plight of a Greek musical genius born two thousand years before his time, who felt the divine afflatus Mozart knew, yet had no way of expressing it.

Even today little advance beyond primitive music may be noted in the Orient. No great musical artists in the western sense have come from the east. Oriental music without the dressing of a Rimsky-Korsakow is made up of brief, threadbare melodies, with little accent to disturb its unperturbed monotony. It must not be forgotten, however, that if the music of the Orient does not make sense to Occidentals, neither does western music mean much to Orientals.

But westerners do not agree among themselves as to what good music is. Entire schools of musicians, as in the controversy between the followers of Brahms and Wagner, are able to discover little resembling their ideas of what music should be in the works of certain other musicians. All musicians have their pet aversions, and some people who are not musical at all have even stronger ones. There are capable performers who revel in Mozart but cannot unravel Ravel. Some do not

[1] Psalm 150—(Moffatt's translation).

care for Wagner, although the majority, including Herr Hitler, do. It is not necessary that such dislikes be made the reason for scholarly research. The great Wagner himself asked if those were mosquitoes or fairies that he heard in the incidental music Mendelssohn had composed for *Midsummer Night's Dream.* Probably Wagner would have scored for Valkyries, and many would have liked it!

What constitutes music is a debatable matter, although debating will not settle it. The more important question is: Do you like it? Few ever answer negatively. There is a truth, if somewhat exaggerated, in the words of Shakespeare:

> The man that hath no music in himself,
> Nor is not mov'd with concord of sweet sounds,
> Is fit for treasons, stratagems, and spoils.
> The motions of his spirit are dull as night
> And his affections dark as Erebus.
> Let no such man be trusted.[2]

Whether a man likes music or not, whether he prefers I. Berlin to J. S. Bach or Gershwin's *Rhapsody in Blue* to Brahms' *Requiem,* he must admit that music is one of the things that can make human life glorious.

Looking back, one cannot help noticing that the development of music parallels many of the significant developments in our culture One will begin then to learn, too, that the music he accepts did not spring complete from the mind of Jubal. It is with some of these parallels and that slow development that the rest of this article will deal.

A powerful influence shaping modern civilization has been the development of technics. Carlyle spoke truly when he defined man as the tool-using animal. The influence of the increasing use of tools and technical methods may be traced in the development of western music. The voice was at first the main means for making music. Until 1550 choral music was the only form admitted within the church, and during many centuries the church was, to all intents, civilization. Then wandering musicians brought with them lutes and other instruments from the east. Accompaniment by an instrument—a most unchurchly practice—inspired secular songs of love and war and hate. These songs spread rapidly. It was natural that certain craftsmen soon received appeals for improved instruments. And the development of better instruments, particularly the organ and the violin, encouraged composers as well as players.

The organ's beginning can be traced to the ancient Greek instrument known as the syrinx or "Pan's pipes." But to make much of that relationship is like saying that a Stradivarius is in direct line of descent from a cornstalk fiddle. Possibly true, but what of it! Something which hap-

[2] *The Merchant of Venice,* Act V, Sc. 1, lines 83-88.

pened when skill, even genius, was applied to the family tree is far more important. We would still be listening to Pan's efforts, "piercing sweet" though they were, or feel stirred by the desert rebec, if expert technicians along the way had not taken part in the evolution of the organ and violin and other instruments like them.

Claudio Monteverde never knew how lucky he was. About 1640 he wrote some music that insulted the fiddlers at the court where he was head musician. It required them to play on two or three strings at once and to pluck the strings with their fingers. They said it was impossible. Then, as now, when an orchestra musician says that, his mind is made up. But, as if by prearrangement, it became possible. New violins appeared that seemed capable of anything that was required of them by the musicians of that time. They came from a small Italian village called Cremona, where a family by the name of Amati had been making instruments for years. These sturdy instruments changed the musical status at once; now the burden was upon the player instead of the violin. That situation has not changed since; when the violin is played well it is a dubious compliment to tell the player that he has a fine instrument.

Claudio Monteverde was not slow in grasping the opportunity. Now to get rid of the recorders, theorbos, lutes, and the other motley that cluttered up the court band, and create an orchestra with a backbone. He began the practice of making violins and their derivatives preponderant. After this start the art and science of instrumentation and orchestration began slowly to develop in Italy and Germany. During the following century the instruments of the brass and woodwind families were likewise perfected and added to the ensemble.

The results of that period of development may be seen in the works of Haydn and Mozart. As far as they go, nothing rivals them. But neither Haydn nor Mozart knew what it meant to give the different instruments personalities, almost souls. It remained for Beethoven to do that. Nor had they learned the art of making the woodwinds converse. Schubert did that. Brahms, Wagner, or Richard Strauss could have taught them. This development depended largely on improved instruments. That improvement is still going on. New metals and plastics and better processes are continually bringing about instruments that musicians of other days would have given much to possess. "Give us the tools" has ever been the cry of the musician. Given the tools they have shown their ability to glorify life. Is this not akin to religion?

By the same token eastern music has remained undeveloped. Eastern instruments have no uniformity and they are not accurately made. Take a Chinese flute for example. It is a completely individual flute. The owner may have decided that for convenience's sake it should have an

additional hole to hang it on the wall. That the new hole may change the pitch seems not to matter at all. This is typical. Get two instruments like that together, and there is a discord; four will provide musical anarchy; a dozen will put a catfight in a class with Beethoven.

Uniformity is what the A says when the western orchestra tunes up. But that uniformity would not be possible without the efforts of technicians dead and alive who made the instruments, as well as of musicians who have been thoroughly grounded technically. Lewis Mumford points out in *Technics and Civilization* that the new orchestra thus created and the new symphonies which were inspired represented singularly well the industrial society that was beginning to develop.[3] Perhaps that is one reason that music is so important in western culture: unconsciously western man senses that the ideal meaning of his culture is represented in his great music, if nowhere else.

Relating music to technics alone, however, is isolating it in a vacuum. During the entire period of what is called western civilization, music has been influenced by many forces other than the machine. For example, the early church developed music as completely expressive of religion's essence as was the Gothic architecture of later centuries. Beginning with plain song there is a positive development through the chants Ambrose devised and Gregory I refined to the surpassing polyphony of Palestrina issuing many centuries later. Nothing else could have been as expressive of the Many in One, the otherworldly, wholly orthodox unity of the mediæval church. The deep spirit of that world was its meaning, not its operation or its causes. It was organized on hierarchical lines, from clod and stone, through trees and animals and man to God himself. Throughout it was a desire to fulfil divine purpose. That desire was known as love. Love was the nature of things which kept them aspiring to be themselves. It was indeed the cosmic force that ordered all creation.[4] The voice of that mystic love is heard in the music of Palestrina.

Likewise the active mood of the Reformation is heard in German chorales. The chorales began when, after centuries, the common people began to understand the liturgy of the church. About the same time symmetry of melody and rhythm began to have artistic importance. The result amid a musical population was spontaneous communal song, folk art of a high order. Martin Luther was himself an able musician, and one of his spearheads of leadership against the Catholic church was the effective use of the chorales for Protestantism. It was an irresistible weapon.

That was but the beginning of the chorale's influence. Chorales were

[3] Harcourt Brace, 1933, p. 202.

[4] See John Herman Randall, *The Making of the Modern Mind,* Houghton, 1926, p. 36.

the main source of J. S. Bach's inspiration. Handel's *Hallelujah Chorus* is based in part on a chorale. Mendelssohn's oratorios and organ sonatas revive their spirit. Franck is imbued with their genius. In solemn horn passages of Brahms' symphonies the ancient echo of the chorale reverberates. The indices to the best modern hymnals contain more references to German chorales than to any other source.

But the courts of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries did most for music. In many ways the anarchical system of petty royalty and warring states is not pleasant to contemplate, but it did for music what nothing else at that time could have done. Dukes and archbishops made orchestras their hobby; they collected musicians much as the affluent of a later day would collect masterpieces of art. Players were required to fill regular hours for their masters. Composers were literally paid for their work by the yard. That day is gone, and the support of music is now on a communal instead of an individual basis. And the bulk of the music made upon order is either forgotten or is safe in museum files. In the main that is good. Most of it was not worth remembering. But this same wasteful system also produced the Bachs, Handel, Haydn, and Mozart; and for this the world can never cease its thanks. If the patronage system had given only J. S. Bach to posterity, it would have been worth all that was spent. Many of the princes and counts of that day are still names because they gave musicians an opportunity to pay for bread with music.

The mistake should not be made, however, of believing that certain composers were great because of the times that produced them. They rapidly outgrew their surroundings. They cannot be subordinated to a time. Of this later. Nor should the inference be made that all music is program music. The *Zeitgeist* may aid in producing a composer, but the man does not necessarily reflect his period. He is concerned with his own musical reaction first of all, and that is what we hear. Only a rash person would undertake to show that Beethoven's symphonies are a counterpart of the civilization of the early nineteenth century, even if the third was originally dedicated to Napoleon. We hear Beethoven. Who would want to hear more?

We are probably too near the latter part of the nineteenth century to relate that period to its music in any accurate sense. The parallel between music and the times is to some extent evident, however, in even a superficial notice of the musical production of England and the continent. Brahms, Wagner, Franck, Debussy, Saint-Saëns are the major stars in a musical firmament that blazed brilliantly on the continent while England, musically as otherwise, basked complacently in the dirty sunlight of the Victorian era. While the continent was producing immortal

symphonies and concertos, the musicians of England produced nothing better than a few hollow ballad operas, some fairly good hymn tunes, and several sprightly operettas. But Gilbert and Sullivan are hardly authentic: they fed on English faults instead of English virtues. But sentiment and satire may be a reasonable summary of the Victorian age, which is seen in its music as well as elsewhere.

A more recent parallel may be observed in the hymnody of the revival era. It is the cheap reflection of cheap religion. Such religion, as well as the music that went with it, is summed up adequately by a hymn that is said to have been sung during that period:

> The bells of hell go ting-a-ling-a-ling,
> For you but not for me;
> The blessed angels sing-a-ling-a-ling,
> Through all eternity.
>
> O death where is thy sting-a-ling-a-ling
> O grave thy victory?
> No sting-a-ling-a-ling, no ting-a-ling-a-ling,
> But sing-a-ling for me![5]

The impersonality of the machine age may be observed in two phases of contemporary music. On the one hand, are the dehumanized products of Ravel, Strawinsky, Honegger, and others. Intellectually fascinating, they speak like Calvinist preachers of old: as dying men to dying men. Their interest is not in life but in a dream world, musical anthropology, or the machine. On the other hand, there is a revulsion musically against the inhumanity of the times which has expressed itself in what is called popular music. Crooners, saxophones, and sobbing trombones represent a futile attempt to bring fellowship and romance back to a world that seems to have abandoned them. But all they achieve is a nostalgia for the good old days or numbness before the terrifying present.

To the Greek poet Tyrtæus is attributed the remark, "Let me write the songs of a nation and I care not who makes the laws." The effect of music is far more difficult to trace than the influence of a culture upon music; the times cannot be isolated, and to some extent music can be. In any case the individual can testify to the effect of music upon himself. Carl Sandburg, for one, has described music's power unforgettably. In *Chicago Poems* he tells of a man who saw the whole world

as a grinning skull and crossbones. . . . Dust to dust and ashes to ashes and then an old darkness and a useless silence. So he saw it all. Then he went to a Mischa

[5] Quoted by Henry Wilder Foote, *Three Centuries of American Hymnody*. Harvard University Press, 1940, p. 269.

Elman concert. Two hours' waves of sound beat on his eardrums. Music washed something or other inside him. Music broke down and rebuilt something in his head and heart. He joined in five encores for the young Russian Jew with the fiddle. When he got outside his heels hit the sidewalk a new way. He was the same man in the same world as before. Only there was a singing fire and a climb of roses everlastingly over the world he looked on.[6]

Of course, this is not the record of an isolated instance. The ones who are responsive to music know similar release and renewal again and again. The value of music, therefore, as an agency of social control should not be minimized. Concerts may be as important as bread—or machine guns.

The Negro spiritual shows that a type of music may arise from a social situation and pave the way for quite unforeseen results. Probably no other single influence has done more to bring a measure of respect and understanding for the colored race. It certainly has helped to provide a better understanding of the Negro's religion, aspirations, and attitudes. With the spiritual came the blues, ragtime, and finally jazz. It is proper to say that they are individual expressions where the spiritual is a communal or folk music. Who is the man who will say that this music has not changed the face of the earth? Speak Burmese at the South Pole and you may not be understood, but whistle a bit of swing and the penguins will circle around.

The novelist, J. B. Priestly, says that popular songs are among the great social phenomena of our times.

> Like colossal butterflies, they go winging their idle frivolous way, past all national boundaries, past all the ranged battleships, tanks, bombing-planes, successfully defying even the strongest dictators. . . . Strictly considered as pieces of music they are contemptible; they cover the earth but their lives are short; but while the dance bands . . . are strumming, moaning and whimpering away at them, their influence upon human destinies, catching and dominating men and women in their easy amorous moods, must be so startlingly vast that no contemporary mind could estimate it.[7]

One unexpected influence of music, noted in passing, was the custom previous to the nineteenth century in Italy, of making eunuchs of male singers that their voices might praise God and Holy Church with pristine freshness. At one time the practice was so common that adult male sopranos were called *castrati.* Some musical children saved themselves by early showing a marked ability for the violin. More were saved when women were permitted to take their rightful places as singers.

As previously stated, the aim of this article is not to prove what the

[6] Quoted by Kirby Page in *Religious Resources,* Farrar and Rinehart, 1939, p. 154.
[7] *They Walk in the City,* Harper, 1936, p. 58.

author thinks is true: that music and *mores* are inseparably connected. He does not pretend to know enough to illustrate that thesis, and he feels that it might be somewhat truistic to attempt it. The effort has rather been to indicate a few stimulating parallels.

An exception, however, must be made, even to this intention. There are a few musicians who rise above the times to defy all generalizations that may be made about them and to make insignificant any parallels that could possibly be drawn. Like the prophets and Jesus, they baffle all efforts to trace the evolution that gave them birth. Only their indescribable music may speak for them. In the musical sphere they are more like gods than like men. Palestrina, J. S. Bach, Handel, Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven, Schubert, Wagner, Brahms, Richard Strauss, and a few others—that is all. Not many. Just as there are not many major prophets or major poets, there are not many major musicians. But there are enough to fill life with beauty. Their music is greater than time or space; it minimizes the common woes and gives vaster meaning to the great ones; it relates all to all. Hearing it often, our spirits grow until we cannot help saying with the priest who said of von Gluck's music, "It is a symbol of the universe."

The encyclopædist, Bernhard Bavinck, concludes his great summary of knowledge with these words:

> Where the scientist and the philosopher have to be silent, the artist, the poet, and the prophet may still speak to us, indeed, this is their truest realm. What can no longer be stated in the ingenious phrases of human wisdom, may still be brought home to the sensitive spirit by the language of religious inspiration, art, and above all, music. . . . This revelation reaches its highest and purest degree when all three speak together, when the poet's gift comes to the help of the prophet, and both are brought by the language of music to a degree of expression infinitely beyond mere words.
>
> Listen with your inner . . . ear, to the great chorus of Creation's rejoicing in Beethoven's Ninth Symphony: hear Schubert's *Allmacht,* Haydn's Star symphony! Or go to church when Brahms' immortal Requiem is being given, and let the eternal Song of Praise fill your ears: "Lord, Thou art worthy of praise, and honour, and glory. For Thou hast created all things." And go on Good Friday to hear Bach's St. Matthew's Passion and the Missa Solemnis and the B minor mass, the two greatest works produced by human, nay superhuman, inspiration. When you then hear the angels in Heaven singing "Sanctus, sanctus, Dominus, Deus Sabaoth"—with Beethoven in mystery far removed from all earthly things; with Bach in endless rejoicing, rising ever higher and higher—then you get a faint inkling of the reason why God did not remain God alone, but created a world with joy, life and love, but also with pain, death, and sin, and of where the solution of this contradiction is to be found. No philosopher in the world can tell you more about it than Bach, Beethoven, and Brahms.[8]

[8] Bavinck, *The Natural Sciences,* Century, 1932, pp. 609 f.

ROGER WILLIAMS GOES TO ROME

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Crozer Theological Seminary

Some little time ago, in the section of the Saturday night edition of the local newspaper devoted to the announcements of church services for the coming day, one of the Baptist churches ran this little gem: "The sacred sacrament of the holy communion will be celebrated." I smiled at the multiplication of clerical adjectives; then it came to me with something of a shock that while this wording was perhaps unusually clumsy and lush it was really symptomatic of a growing, if unconscious, tendency in many supposedly unliturgical or nonliturgical bodies to play with strange fires.

For churches such as this one the Lord's supper is not a sacrament; strictly, if established usage means anything, it is not even "holy communion." There is no miracle performed; the cubes of bread and the tiny glasses of grape juice are and remain precisely that—a bit of bread and a tablespoonful of grape juice of precisely the same analysis and value as those to be found in most of the pantries and frigidaires of those present. To be sure, there is for probably most of those who join in the service an increased awareness of being in church, an added inducement to reflection and quiet taking stock in the midst of life's hurly-burly. Familiar words of Scripture are repeated again; not infrequently in so definitely stereotyped a form as to make any omission or variation, however slight, seem almost blasphemous. A friend told me not long since that after the first communion service in a church to which he had just been called a woman came to him in some concern: "Pastor, I didn't hear you say, 'Till he come.'" "No," said her pastor, "and you never will." I can still remember the feeling of amazement, almost horror, which I, as a small boy, felt when the new minister in our church baptized several folk. As he stood in the baptistery, the candidates faced the congregation's left. It had never been so done in my little corner of Israel. I was actually afraid that this innovation might render the whole exercise invalid. Every minister, I fancy, can recall similar experiences of his own. Those to whom a nonsacramental, that is, in brutal language, nonmagical, foundation is essential for true religion must, it would appear to me, agree that instead of introducing fresh inducements to muddy thinking we need seriously to prune out a deal already there. And in passing it may be remarked that a good place to begin would be with the hand raised in benedictory blessing and by placing, if not on the *index expurgatorius*, at least under lock and key

such words as *holy* and *sacred* and (*pace* Van Dyke) such innocent-sounding but mischievous phrases as "the sacrament of life."

But lest it be charged that I am making a mountain out of a molehill, confusing a piece of sloppy writing in one church's advertisement with a definite trend, let us look about a bit.

What is happening to church architecture? That many so-called churches—I conform reluctantly to current usage and use the word *church* in the sense of a building set apart for public worship, although I greatly prefer the more apt *meetinghouse*—are monstrosities I freely admit. The so-called "Akron-plan" edifice, with the pulpit in the corner and with a semicircular array of seats, is an especially horrible example. It is almost unbelievable that the mind of man could sink so low. Any method, however drastic, to alter such I heartily approve, although frankly I can think of none effective without kerosene and a ruthlessly applied torch. Many other churches need to be fixed up, but must we go Gothic?

Gothic cathedrals are beautiful structures to wander through and (probably) to see the colorful miracle of the Mass in. They were produced to meet specific needs; but that need was not to provide a meetinghouse where a congregation might assemble for a service in which brains and ears play a prominent part. Aside from all the technical difficulties involved in trying to adapt such a form of architecture to a service of worship where the sermon is—I blatantly and unshamefacedly emphasize it—the central feature, it is all wrong from the point of view of nonsacramental religion, except when the latter is slightly inebriated. The natural focal point for such an edifice is the altar. All else is secondary. Thus the pulpit is hung up out of the way on one side, the lectern with its Bible is shoved to the other. This is ideal for the sacramentarians; it is fatal for nonsacramental religion when its devotees feel that they must keep up with the ecclesiastical Joneses and get a little real class into their meetinghouse by showing that they can afford two pulpits, too. All nature—and this includes ecclesiastical architecture—abhors a vacuum. Move the pulpit to one side or split it in two and shove the pieces out of the way, and something must fill the gap. What more natural or ready-to-hand than the communion table about which hitherto the congregation has in theory joined? Thus this is lifted up onto the platform and placed at the focus. A miracle has been wrought: a table has become an altar. But an oak, or even a mahogany, table looks a little self-conscious in so rarified an atmosphere. A cross— a homemade one will do if no other is available—flanked by a couple of candles tones down the bareness. Now the stage is set. Naturally the minister will have to face that table at least at times—if only to set the collection

plates upon it—and by that act he becomes a priest. A man may button his collar in the back, though why he should want to I do not know, and remain a minister; let him turn his back on his congregation, and he becomes a priest. Very soon the new odor of sanctity will become audible or vocal. If physical genuflections are not indulged in before the newborn altar, mental genuflections will be. The word *auditorium* will be eschewed as a coarse and vulgar word; instead we must speak of the *sanctuary;* and the somewhat violently produced apse becomes bearer of a double portion of this sanctity: it has now become the *sanctum sanctorum,* or clawed over into the vernacular, for these ecclesiastical face-lifters find it easier to displace pulpits than to learn Latin, *holy of holies.* Here, some of the superecclesiasts would have us believe, God Almighty is to be reckoned especially present, invisible but very real, throughout the service. Some of the irreverent may feel that this table, even though garnished with cross and candles, is less adapted to the needs of a celestial throne than were the triune chairs which it has displaced. Another sure-fire method for encouraging even the casual to sense the increase in the invisible aura of sanctity is by the judicious use of *objets d'art* in and about the sanctuary. To be sure, as yet most of the experimenters have not gone the whole way over the Apennines with the use of statuary. That would be heathen—at least pagan. But fetching effects are achieved by resting a picture against the altar, or, in case the pulpit has still resisted dislocation, against that. A spotlight directed against said picture is believed to do things to the prospective worshiper.

Before concluding this section on the mysteries of architecture, let me remark, lest I seem an utter Philistine, that I heartily agree that there is very real need for attention to the interiors and exteriors of many churches, and that it often can be achieved without resulting in a Queen Anne front and Mary Ann back. If a congregation is fortunate enough to be blessed with that one gem of American architecture, a colonial meetinghouse such as is still common in villages of New England and occasionally to be found even on less-privileged earth, let it thank God. All it needs to do for the exterior is to keep it painted and to be sure that the grass is cut and the wind-blown litter picked up. The interior, too, should not require drastic revision unless, as is tragically so often the case, so-called stained glass of the Early Pullman era has been allowed to make its appearance. Here, of course, resolution is justified. Fortunately clear window glass is still in the market. Otherwise satisfactory repairs can usually be made with a paintbrush, claw hammer, and wastebasket: the first for obvious purposes; the second to pull out nails used to support golden texts, sacred mottoes, and statistics as to

last Sunday's attendance and collection; the third—most important of all—for the disposal of archaic calendars, empty boxes which formerly contained cough drops, and slightly messy fragments of the wrappings of other confections which have a curious way of persisting in the hymnbook racks of dissenters.

These paragraphs should not be construed as condoning the vulgar, the cheap, and the unseemly either in the appearance of the meeting-house or in the conduct of its services. I heartily approve of gowns for the choir—preferably of black—for white cottas unless immaculate are no blessing and, even if clean, often provide startling vistas when worn by overplump sopranos and slightly obese tenors. The value of the gown is simply in the line of good taste: like charity, it will hide a multitude of sins. Similarly a gown for the preacher. That, too, adds a simple dignity and sobriety to the service, especially now that even semiformal dress is so rarely worn. (There is another very practical, if mundane, value on hot Sundays which is well known to the preacher.) A gown exerts a decided check upon pulpit gymnastics, wisecracks, and other ministerial vulgarities; and it does not have the slightest sacerdotal implications. Roger Williams can wear an academic gown and hood (if he is fortunate enough to own one) without the charge of being a penitent in the snows of Canossa.

But some will say: How about the organ pipes? Well, how about them? I am not overpartial to them, even though I do not fear them as rabidly as do many of my clerical friends. Of course they should never have been there. Both organ and choir ought to be in a loft at the rear of the auditorium. They could then be a real part of the congregation and face the preacher, like everybody else, as he leads the common worship. In addition, if the church is cursed by a gyrating, time-beating choirmaster, the congregation would be freed from the necessity of watching his pirouettings. But even if the much-maligned organ pipes are to the fore, they are far less of a menace than is an altar.

The tendencies of our modern Esaus, forgetful of their non-sacerdotal heritage, to hanker after the fleshpots of sacramentarianism are not limited to prettifying the meetinghouse. They are far-reaching and appear to me very serious. A whole treatise might be written. A few examples must suffice.

One is the aping of the rites of other communions with the real significance, good or bad as the case may be, disguised or sugar-coated. Whether baptism by immersion is or is not of sacrosanct nature for Baptists fortunately does not need to be discussed in this essay. One thing is certain, and that is the belief that baptism is solely for believers. Baptism of babies is out. *But* while many Baptist churches continue

to stress that, they are seemingly wistfully fearful lest other churches which do practice it will get an earlier and unfair start. Should expediency suffer for the sake of conviction? A thousand times no. Thus we are treated to the spectacle of the dedication of children. Not a drop of water is used; thus the rite is truly baptistic. And, with a suspicious degree of self-consciousness, we are told that it is not the dedication of the children (even though Hannah and Samuel might be cited, were it necessary, as a biblical warrant) but of the parents. Of course it is nothing of the sort; it is simply the tinkering over into a meaningless farce of a totally different rite which had a definite (even if vicious) implication. It reminds me of a dear old lady whom I loved very dearly. When she joined the church, now more than seventy years ago, she gave up going to the theatre. Throughout her life she adhered to her resolution. Then came the movies. When she was about sixty a movie house in Boston opened under the intriguing name "Bijou Dream." The absence of the word *theatre* gave the old lady pause. She wanted to see the pictures—she was less definite about the vaudeville which occasionally was thrown in as trading stamps—but she did not want to go back on her earlier vow. Thus with perfect placidity she could attend the Bijou Dream; you couldn't have hired her to go next door to Keith's or the old Boston Theatre. This unvarnished vignette of life is offered without apology or further comment.

But not only do we love to dedicate children (or parents); we are in a veritable orgy of dedication. No really up-and-coming church would think of starting to use a new set of hymnbooks (even the so-called "gospel songs" of the more objectionable type) without having them dedicated. Whenever a new chandelier is hung in the sanctuary, new organ pipes (even dummy ones) are installed, or a fresh coat of paint is applied, a service of dedication seems called for. And the clever folk who edit the hymnals have dutifully come across with an appropriate liturgy for each and every occasion. Of course this is not limited to the spiritual kin of Roger Williams or even reserved for the sanctuary. In a near-by shipyard, from whose ways tankers, tramp steamers, and transports are being launched almost daily, there is a slight and interesting variation. One day the wife of a boss carpenter (oh yes, we are fast becoming a democratic nation) or of a naval admiral launches one with a bottle of champagne; on the next day the Episcopal bishop starts his on its way with an episcopal blessing. A study of the subsequent careers of the several ships might seem in order. The suggestion of this as an appropriate topic for a dissertation by some prospective candidate for the degree of master of religious education is hereby respectfully offered. But reverting to the more immediate topic at hand:

What is the point of this somewhat promiscuous blessing of the bells? It would appear to me another example of our self-conscious hankering after forbiddne fruit. I knew of a colored preacher in the days of pulpit "Prince Alberts." He sorely wanted one of those glorious garments but could not afford it. He finally solved the problem in a way not unknown to modern liturgists from the ranks of the nonliturgical: he obtained a slightly used linen coat of the style then called "dusters" and dyed it black.

A particularly conspicuous example of our progress along the "Road to Rome" is the increasing fondness for *extempore* communion services. Theological seminaries of supposedly rock-ribbed Puritan ancestry find it helpful for the graduating class to have holy communion before breakfast on the morning of commencement. No really up-to-date conference of theological students from the several seminaries in solemn conclave assembled for the solution of all problems: theological, economic, and educational—which problems never seem to clamor for solution during vacations, but are instant in their demands during term time—can meet without at least one service of communion. One consequence of this trend is that the executive officers of those theological seminaries whose tendencies are nonsacramental and whose ecclesiastical cupboards are bare are plagued to know how to avoid having to receive as a parting gift from the graduating class a really up-to-the-minute communion service for subsequent Masses for future neophytes. Why should one seminary stay out of line when all the truly tony ones are only too ready to give visual display at the slightest provocation, or without any, that they are really religious? This is all somewhat reminiscent of the song we used to sing during the last war, "How you going to keep 'em down on the farm after they've seen Paree?"

So, too, Baptist preachers, whose fathers would certainly have known better, feel ill-equipped unless they have an ecclesiastical first-aid bag in which they can carry communion to those who for one reason or another—good, bad, or indifferent—missed the regular monthly service and who are being taught to think that they are in consequence in a parlous state—especially if they are in the hospital or are otherwise infirm. To be sure, I know enough of early Christian history to know that this practice was well underway by the middle of the second century. I also know, as some of my friends apparently do not, that by that time the church had become thoroughly sacramental, and that this rite, if it had not already arrived, was well on the way to the purely magical. It appears to me that this particular service which, for us at least, has come to be inextricably associated with the Sunday service where the whole church worships together, is in grave peril of being turned into

a thoroughly sacramental and magical rite—a sort of combination of spiritual spring tonic and near-extreme unction—and incidentally of becoming thoroughly cheapened. Communion services held, as one might say, *en route* in the course of conferences and conventions would appear to me to be of the same scarcely doubtful propriety as the not unknown practice of calling for a hymn or inviting Brother Jones to lead in prayer, to restore peace or drown out opposition, during a meeting which has got slightly out of hand.

As a sort of correlate to this growing habit of using the service of communion as a pious embellishment, *i.e.*, to make the secular holy, is the so-called "retreat." In passing it may be remarked that the use of the word *retreat* appears singularly inopportune. Now, if ever, we need hear the word attributed to Moses, "Speak unto the children of Israel that they go forward." At best it is calculated to heighten the vicious antithesis drawn between sacred and secular. Thus students in our seminaries seem to feel it essential to hold these semioccasional retreats to keep their religion at full steam. It never seems to occur to them or to their leaders that if ever a man is truly religious it is when he is doing his work faithfully and without excuse. May God help our churches if the ministers of the future become convinced that to put spiritual ginger into their piety they must drop their work and hold prayer meetings and communion services as a sort of sacred pep-meeting. But no, an eminent group of American theologians sets the pace; we cannot hold a session now without devoting twenty minutes of the morning of the second day to a distinctly self-conscious "retreat." During those moments we become religious; it hallows in mysticwise the rest of the session. The full fruitage of this tendency is modern; it has, however, its roots in the past. Some twenty years ago, as a newcomer to a theological faculty, I stood watching a game of baseball on the campus. The festivities were in honor of the visit of a near-by school of female religious workers. At the end of the seventh inning the teams came off the field and held an impromptu prayer meeting. After the final "amen" the game was resumed. That sort of holy "seventh-inning stretch" was new to me; whether my interested queries as to the reason for the practice were at all responsible, I have never been able to figure out. At any rate, the practice, so far as I know, has never been resumed. But I think of it annually during the twenty minutes of holy calm at the annual meeting of the American Theological Society as we gird up our loins between such secular and wordly subjects as the nature and attributes of God. To one man vitally interested in genuine religion and who dearly loves the Christian church all of this is a tocsin of alarm, or, to change the figure, perilously close to the

multitude of sacrifices, the burnt offerings of rams, the fat of fed beasts, the blood of bullocks and lambs and he-goats, which, if Isaiah knew what he was talking about, the Almighty has long since had enough of.

But what shall I more say? Space forbids more than the bare mention of confessionals (replete with everything save authority) which prominent Baptist ministers are reputed to hold with extreme satisfaction, at least to themselves; of the growing enthusiasm for Lent, Holy Week, and Good Friday communions. As I see the growing fanfare and feverish effort to prove oneself religious by his outward acts and antics, more and more I come to sympathize with the word of a one-time theological seminary president, pained as he approached another Easter season: "If any of you gentlemen can tell me where I can find a Baptist church free from this folderol, I'll go there next Sunday." Some of my friends are still a bit aghast that when some years ago I chanced to spend Easter in Jerusalem I did not attend any of the services—sunrise at the "garden tomb," pageantry at the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, or any of the others—but spent the day quite alone on the Mount of Olives, reading once again the matchless story and trying to relive it in the Sabbath calm.

Perhaps I have overdrawn the picture. Undoubtedly many will think that I am grossly unfair, that I have made a mountain out of a molehill. I hope none will be so mistaken as to feel that I am either cynical toward religion or tired of the church. As I remarked in a preceding paragraph, I love the church—what it is and what it has stood for through the years. I am proud to feel myself one in a long line of devoted men and women. In addition, I may remark, I am proud to be a member of a local Baptist church where in a simple but dignified setting I can join with my friends in a reverent and satisfying service. My protests are directed at what seems to me an ill-advised forgetfulness of a heritage which is of abiding value and at the thoughtless near-imitation of things dragged over from a wholly different world, things of undoubted value to many honest men, even though they are valueless to me, which imitation not only cheapens them but bids fair to make of them a menace.

From Off the Campus and On

BUILDING FOR TOMORROW appears to be the concern of an increasing number of our leaders and near-leaders, political and religious alike. Without a far more rigid testing of the building materials than would seem to be the order of the day it may be pessimistically, but confidently, predicted that many of these towers now in process of construction are doomed to collapse. The structure which Dr. Matthews would erect may be less ornate than some, but its foundations are solid and there is no evidence of jerry-building. Readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY will be interested to know that after a long and distinguished career at Crozer Dr. Matthews retired this past June, becoming professor *emeritus* of Old Testament. He is now residing in Lansdowne, Pennsylvania.

A. Irving Hallowell is professor of anthropology and head of this department in the University of Pennsylvania. In 1940-1941 he was a Guggenheim fellow. His study of the Saulteaux Indians in the neighborhood of Lake Winnipeg and his recent book, *The Role of Conjuring in Saulteaux Society,* have won him wide acclaim. As an anthropologist, he looks at religion, and with interesting results.

Professor Harkness, for many years head of the department of church history at Crozer, is too well-known to readers of the CROZER QUARTERLY, of which he is a former editor, to need introduction. He is the president of The American Baptist Historical Society and editor of its journal, the *Chronicle.* Few men are so well-fitted to write upon America's heritage of colonial culture.

The article by Professor Irwin should prove of interest both to professional students of the Old Testament and to laymen. It makes a distinct and telling contribution to a problem which has been hotly debated through the years. Dr. Irwin has been professor of Old Testament at the University of Chicago since 1930, following twelve years on the faculty of the University of Toronto. In 1934 he was a member of the Oriental Institute's expedition at Megiddo.

The author of the article, "Music and *Mores,*" may best be introduced in his own crisp words (which he had no idea would see publication): "There is little to say about myself. I was born in Albion, Pennsylvania, a small town near Erie. Studied music during boyhood and was regarded proficient enough on the violin to play symphonically and as a soloist at the age of fifteen. Graduated from St. Lawrence University in 1930 and from Canton Theological School in 1932. Member of the Phi Beta Kappa. Minister of First Universalist Church of Urbana, Illinois, 1932-1936; First Universalist Church of Columbus, 1936-1940; Church of the Restora-

tion (Universalist), Philadelphia, 1940, which position I fill at present. Married. One son." [Editorial postscript: Read "Two Sons."]

The editor of the CROZER QUARTERLY essays the role of Ajax the Less. Modern Cassandras and their devotees will probably invoke Athene's lightning. He has been professor of New Testament at Crozer and lecturer in patristics in the Graduate School of the University of Pennsylvania since 1924.

No less than twelve distinguished scholars "from off the campus" have contributed reviews for this issue. Many of our readers write in to say that they turn first of all to the section devoted to reviews and notices when the QUARTERLY arrives. So long as publishers continue to produce (and send for review) books we expect to stress this useful department. Professor Beare is on the faculty of The Presbyterian College, an affiliate of McGill University, Montreal. Dr. Boisen, a lecturer and experienced research associate in the Chicago Theological Seminary, will be remembered for his article, "Theology in the Light of Psychiatric Experience" (January, 1941). Edgar S. Brightman, of Boston University, is a frequent and acceptable figure in these pages. Professor Cadbury is Hollis professor of divinity in Harvard University and an eminent New Testament critic. Dr. Carver has been for many years professor of missions at the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville. It is a pleasure to introduce Rabbi Samuel S. Cohon, who is professor of Jewish theology in Hebrew Union College, Cincinnati. Dr. Day, a graduate and trustee of Crozer, is minister of the Seventh Baptist Church in Baltimore. His many years of legal experience before he entered the ministry enable him to appraise critically *The Pastor's Legal Adviser*. Professor Goodenough, of Yale University, has been for many years editor of the *Journal of Biblical Literature*. He is a recognized authority on Philo and other recondite and thorny subjects, among which are the problems to which the book he here reviews is devoted. No name stands higher on the list of America's truly great scholars than that of James A. Montgomery, for many years, until his recent retirement, head of the department of Semitics at the University of Pennsylvania. It is a particular pleasure to welcome him to our pages. Dr. Newell, of Harwich, Massachusetts, is (as was said last issue) "a frequent and valued contributor." Professor J. C. Scammell is in the English department at Boston University. An article of his, "The Tongues of Men, or of Angels?" appeared in January, 1942. For many years W. K. Wright has been a member of the department of philosophy of Dartmouth College. Articles of his have appeared from time to time in these pages. At the present moment the editor is trying to woo another from this sweet-spirited but incisive thinker.

BOOK REVIEWS

A History of Early Christian Literature, by Edgar J. Goodspeed, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, pp. xiii, 324, $2.50.

This is the book that we have been waiting for. The list of volumes and other studies in the field of patristics is long; in addition to the detailed treatments of individual Fathers, there have been many and brilliant surveys of lasting value: Bardenhewer, Harnack, Krüger—to mention three out of many—are still names to conjure with. Nonetheless there was a real need for a book which would bring the story up to date, for the discoveries and research during the past thirty years have greatly widened our knowledge. It is a conservative statement that literally scores of writings—letters, tracts, and treatises—formerly known only by title have been discovered in part, not infrequently in substantial part, through the excavator's spade and the critic's insight; and in many cases these have materially altered our view of early Christianity.

One of the glaring weaknesses of modern theological education is its neglect of the Fathers. (We must be streamlined, cellophane wrapped, and equipped with a zipper.) Earlier generations of students had at least a bowing acquaintance with the great figures of Christianity's pioneer days. It is probably an understatement that not one newborn bachelor of divinity in a hundred today could write ten articulate lines about any one of the ante-Nicene Fathers; if the figure be raised to fifteen lines, most of their professors would—or should—feel embarrassed. Dr. Goodspeed's fascinating and eminently readable volume will be welcomed by experts to whom much of the material is, of course, reasonably familiar; it is to be hoped that it will have a wide sale and receive the close study which it merits from those who will find it an invaluable *vade mecum* in a hitherto unknown land.

The scope of the volume is the Christian literature (of course excluding the canonical writings of the New Testament) produced prior to the Council of Nicæa. The early chapters are concerned with the letters, revelations, gospels, acts, and apologies which came during the first century after the crucifixion. Then follow telling discussions of the contributions of such figures as Justin, Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, Julius Africanus, Dionysius of Alexandria, Cyprian, Novatian, Arnobius, and Lactantius. Under Goodspeed's skillful treatment these characters become more than names; we see the contemporary currents and crosscurrents that ran at times so swiftly and with such lasting effect. It is not too much to say that the student who really masters this volume will emerge with a reasonably solid foundation in early church history.

In a brief review it is manifestly impossible to survey with any completeness the many points of excellence. A few may be mentioned. His treatment of the non-canonical gospels—*Gospel of the Egyptians, Gospel of the Hebrews* (to be sharply differentiated from the *Gospel of the Ebionites*), the recently discovered *British Museum Gospel,* the two versions (?) of the *Gospel of Thomas*—all this is excellent. His theory that the *Acts of Paul* (of which *Paul and Thecla* is an important section) was produced *ca.* 160-170, in no small part to neutralize the emphasis of the Pastoral Epistles by its insistence that it was better for women to teach than to wed, has much to commend it. His treatment of the so-called *Didache,* distinguishing the later (*ca.* 150 A.D.) writing from the earlier *Doctrina,* which he thinks was a Jewish-Christian (not Jewish) document produced early in the second century, perhaps at Antioch, is

excellent. One of the purposes of Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* was probably to oppose Marcion. Not only is our so-called "second" *Apology* of Justin an appendix to the "first"; it is highly improbable that Justin ever wrote but one. I Clement was probably occasioned (as was I Peter) by the stinging challenge of Hebrews that Roman Christians awake to their responsibilities. The invigorating atmosphere of Ephesus—the literary centre of early Christianity—probably had a stimulating effect on the hitherto unliterary Ignatius, leading him to take up his pen. These are but samples of the book as a whole.

Naturally, critics will not always see eye to eye. Personally, I am still unconvinced that *Hermas* is as early as Goodspeed insists (95-96 A.D.) or that it is essentially non-pseudonymous, *i.e., bona fide* autobiography, though I quite agree that it shows evidence of revision. Nor does it appear to me that he has extracted from the words of the enigmatic Papias "the only possible meaning." Rather it seems to me that that worthy's qualification of the Gospel of Mark is made in the light of Matthew—essentially our Greek Matthew—which Papias knew and highly prized. As a good Greek should, Goodspeed stresses the composition in Greek of such writings as the *Gospel of the Hebrews* (of course, also the *Gospel of the Egyptians*), the *Gospel of the Ebionites,* and Tatian's *Diatessaron.* To me this is highly probable, but the presumption is that all breasts will not remain tranquil nor all pens quiet.

One of the great values of the volume is the focusing of attention upon the vast amount of literature still undiscovered and the clear-cut way this is brought to attention in the hope that in successive years many of these lacunæ will be filled. As has often been piously remarked, "God has yet more light to let break forth." It is to be confidently expected that critics and archæologists will be the agents of this hoped-for refulgence. The curious notion still persists among the ignorant that all the discoveries have been made, and that biblical and patristic scholars are simply sifting old sand. Books like this should go a long way toward disabusing that notion.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

The Odyssey of a Faith, by Bernard Heller, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xvii, 277, $2.50.

This volume presents no continuous account of the history of Judaism nor of its main currents, but merely a series of fifteen chapters dealing with episodes or problems in Jewish religious and cultural life of a more or less romantic character. The viewpoint of the author is that of Reform Judaism and spiritual Zionism. He makes clear in his preface that Judaism connotes for him "not merely certain theological tenets, but the sum total of all the Jew's expressions and aspirations." Checking the possible latitudinarianism of the phrase "all expressions," he limits Judaism in the subsequent paragraph to "the spiritual experience of Catholic Israel."

In keeping with the nature of the work, Dr. Heller adopted the essay form—occasionally running into homiletical form—instead of the more integrated and objective treatment which we expect in a book of scientific character. This form lent itself more readily to the author's expression of his personal faith and his enthusiasm for various causes and ideals as well as of his great fondness for philosophic speculation. Almost every chapter is written so as to illustrate what the author terms the "Law of Synthetic Adjustment." Upon examination this law turns out to be the much overworked Hegelian triple dialectic, of which the author himself wrote in a moment of reduced awareness: "Whether the unfoldment of Judaism can be cited as an illustration of the dialectic process is questionable"

(p. 229). In consequence, the arrangement of this historical data into triads appears quite strained.

Dr. Heller writes with force and conviction. Occasionally he is carried away by certain enthusiasms in which some critical readers may not be ready to follow him. To cite two related examples from his opening chapter "The Nomad Turns Farmer": Biblical history hardly warrants the view that the Israelites of the period of the conquest represented a body of social reformers revolting against the economic inequity and particularly of the inequality of possession of landed property in Canaan (p. 5). Amos and Isaiah were still centuries ahead. Neither does biblical theology furnish ground for the conclusion that the removal of these social ills constituted "the heart and essence of the religion of the prophets" (p. 11). The prophetic passion for justice stemmed from their vision of God's holiness. The author himself states further on that the God of the prophets "wanted a circumcised heart, an aspiration toward holiness, a dauntless determination on the part of man to reach the Pisgah heights of divine truth and sublimity" (p. 21).

The reader will find helpful light in Dr. Heller's chapters on "Jew Meets Greek," "The Pharisees Democratize the Faith," "The Half Open Door" (on Proselytism), and "Maimonides Rationalizes the Faith." The picture of the mystical movement of Hasidism in the chapter "The Saint of Podolia," though based on secondary materials, is the most effective in the book. In the last three chapters, dealing with the modern period, the reader is given not so much a systematic presentation of the facts, problems, and personalities of the political emancipation of Jewry in the nineteenth century, of the reformatory movements, and of Zionism as an intimate record of the heart searchings, strivings, and struggles within the various camps of contemporary Jewry. They are set forth in a warm and at times confessional way.

The thoughtful reader of this book probably will be impressed with two important points which the author makes: 1. "The more than three thousand year old story of the spiritual adventure of the Jew reveals signposts which can guide individuals and nations to steer clear of deadly pits or precipices" (p. xvi). 2. "To the extent to which the Jew is battling for the right to live his distinctive life and dream the dreams of his Seers, he is fighting for humanity and freedom" (p. 228).

SAMUEL S. COHON

The Babylonian Genesis: The Story of the Creation, by Alexander Heidel, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, pp. xi, 131, and 18 plates, $1.50.

The Babylonian epic of creation, *Enûma elish,* has been known for almost a century and translated more recently for nontechnical readers in such popular collections as Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte zum Alten Testament,* Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament,* Barton, *Archæology and the Bible.* Dr. Heidel, who is a research assistant on the Assyrian dictionary project of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago, has made a fresh translation of the epic, filling in many *lacunæ* of former translations by making use of the fragments found at Kish (1924-25) and at Uruk (1928-29).

Although *Enûma elish* is the chief source of Babylonian cosmogony, other creation stories are included in Chapter II. In order to complete the collection of material on the subject, the author gives translation and notes of the Greek sources of Damascus and Berossus. The concluding chapter is a discussion of the Old Testament parallels, an inquiry into the extent to which the Old Testament passages in question are dependent on Babylonian sources, and what "impli-

cations" this may have for questions of religious faith." The author gives a balanced discussion of the alleged points of similarity in *Enûma elish* and in Gen. 1:1-2:3. He revives the *creatio ex nihilo* argument, admits that it cannot rest upon the *bārâ* ("to create") argument, and proceeds to deduce it from *bĕrêshîth* ("in the beginning"). In order to buttress his argument for the creation of the world out of nothing—as he interprets the biblical account—he quotes with utter disregard for chronology from II Maccabees, John 1, and Hebrews 11, "passages which have likewise sprung from Hebrew soil."

In the interest of a personal faith based on the unique originality of the Holy Scriptures, the author seeks to rid the pages of the Old Testament from taint (even in vocabulary) of more primitive notions of cosmogony. He presents fairly the evidence for the connection of *tēhôm* ("the deep"—Gen 1:2) and the goddess Ti'âmat in the epic, but he is reluctant to admit a connection except to say that the words go back to a common Semitic form (p. 85). The obvious parallels given by Gunkel in *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit* between certain Old Testament passages and the conflict between Marduk and Ti'âmat are repeated in all fairness. But Heidel seeks to excuse such borrowings with the conclusion that "while some of these Old Testament figures of speech are no doubt due to foreign influence of some kind, others may quite as well have been suggested to the sacred writers by their own observations of nature" (p. 94). Is divine revelation through nature in the locale of Palestine any more authorative for religion than revelation through Babylonian myth?

Admitting that certain features—especially the sequence of the acts of creation—of the biblical account were borrowed from Babylonian cosmogony, the author proceeds to establish a doctrine of revelation to allow this borrowing. His concluding apologetic is: "If certain features of the biblical account *were* derived from the Babylonian, this was done in conformity with the will of Him who according to Heb. 1:1 revealed Himself 'in divers manners'" (p. 117).

Despite this annoyance which the reviewer experienced at the uncalled-for intrusion of a theological apologetic in a statement of a historical problem, this is a valuable collection of material on a much-discussed problem of Old Testament studies. It is presented concisely, not overburdened with technical discussion, neatly printed by the near-printing process. Dr. Heidel is to be thanked for this extremely useful and convenient monograph. May the work dealing with the Babylonian flood stories, which he promises (p. 110), be forthcoming. Equally valuable would be a similar monograph dealing with the Phœnician Genesis making use of the Ras Shamra material and the later Greek sources for Phœnician cosmogony.

JAMES B. PRITCHARD

The Arabic Commentary of Yefet ben 'Ali the Karaite on the Book of Hosea, by Philip Birnbaum, Philadelphia, Dropsie College, 1942, pp. lxii, 247, $1.50.

This volume is a doctoral dissertation, and it reflects great credit upon the formally youthful student and on the college that developed him. Apart from the preface the text is in Hebrew characters, with the Arabic also presented after Jewish wont with the usual diacritical marks on certain Hebrew letters to represent the overplus of the Arabic alphabet. Arabic became for the Jews of the Near East and the Mediterranean area the language of everyday life, and so a cosmopolitan vehicle, similar to Latin in the western Christian world. Reference may be made for this element not only in speech but also in letters and philosophy to the section on "Hebrew-Arabic Thought" in *The Legacy of Israel,* by I. Abraham, E. R.

Bevan, C. Singer (1928), pp. 184 ff. Likewise Arabic as the middleman preserved for the West much otherwise lost of the Greek philosophy. As a Karaite, Yefet ben 'Ali, who lived in Iraq in the tenth century, belonged to a Jewish sect that depended for its religion and thought solely upon the Scriptures and their immediate interpretation, rejecting the authority of the rabbis as such, of the Talmud, etc. In this respect the Karaites, who still survive, are similar to the many groups of "Bible Christians" that have sprung up in the Protestant world. They stand for a fact in Jewry, not known at large by Christians, of the varieties, sects (cf. the use of the word in Acts 5:17, etc.), evident at the turn of our era in Pharisees, Sadducees, the pietistic Chasidim, the ascetic Essenes, etc., while the early Christians were known as the sect of the Nazarenes (Acts 24:5). And also, as may not be generally known, Jewry today divides into several distinct groups. In New York City there are three Jewish seminaries, representing as many divisive tendencies.

The care exhibited in this volume appears in the use of eight MSS, existing in England, Russia, Egypt, which have either been carefully collated or used directly by means of photostats. Sixteen pages offer *variæ lectiones.* The author presents summarily but clearly the independent characteristics of Yefet in his relation to Talmud and commentators like Sa'adyah. The text is further furnished with notes carefully cross-referencing to Bible, Targum, Ibn Ezra, Kimchi, *et al.* This mediæval Jewish exegesis was of primary importance in the rediscovery of the Hebrew Bible in the Christian Renascence and the Reformation, with direct influence upon the great Protestant translations, the authors of which were directly acquainted with the Jewish exegesis. Even John Milton knew his Rabbinics. There might be desiderated an English translation of the text presented in this volume, if only to assert to our modern world the historical importance of that Jewish scholarship. The reviewer in his *Commentary on Daniel* used with interest Yefet's commentary on that book, published in Arabic along with English translation by Margoliouth in 1889.

JAMES A. MONTGOMERY

Science, Philosophy, and Religion: A Symposium, published by the Conference on Science, Philosophy, and Religion, New York, 1942, pp. xv, 559.

These 574 pages, packed with the composite wisdom of eighty-eight scholars, each a specialist in his own field, present in full the papers and discussions contributed to the second conference of Science, Philosophy, and Religion, which was held in Columbia University, September 8-11, 1941. The conference was a continuation of that held in 1940; Symposium no. 1 was reviewed in the July, 1941, issue of the CROZER QUARTERLY. The first conference sought to find a common intellectual standing ground for the three disciplines, science, philosophy, and theology. This endeavors to express the relation of each of these groups to the democratic way of life. The divergence of opinion was much sharper in the first than in the second. Apparently agreement as to the way of life may be attained more easily than agreement in theory, philosophic or theologic.

The meat of this volume is found in ten papers, each of which was matured within small, local group conferences, to each of which is appended the critical reaction of each member of the contributing group. This procedure has proven to be of the utmost value in the accurate and technical use of language, the appreciation of emphasis, and the evaluation of differing points of view. They are serious contributions toward mutual understanding, though much is still to be desired by way of definition. In addition to these ten semicomposite contributions there are nineteen

papers or addresses, each by an accredited scholar, that have not passed through the melting pot.

Attention can be drawn to only a few of the significant features. The contribution of the anthropologists, Mead, Benedict, Kluckhohn, Lee, Gorer, and Bateson, on the comparative study of culture and the purposive cultivation of democratic values is of paramount interest (pp. 56-97). The importance of method is insisted on. An integrating system of values and an adequate documentation of the total correlated cultures is a prime necessity. But no less significant is their emphasis and agreement on objectives. We must be guided not toward definite ends but in a definite direction. Definite ends are unknown, and to hypothecate the absolute is to erect barriers to all progress. Human society is always in the experimental stage without a final blueprint. But in experience through experiment we should ever gain a closer approximation to higher values.

In an entirely different field, that of the law, are two excellent discussions: "The Role of the Law in a Democracy" by Frank E. Horack, followed by comments by five others (pp. 173-195), and "The Function of the Law in a Democratic Society" by Charles E. Clark (pp. 480-492). Both papers are in fundamental agreement, and the revolutionary conception of law has been most succinctly expressed by Clark. A new era was opened when fifty years ago a professorship in law was established at Harvard and the "case system" was made basic to all legal studies. Previously the law was sacred, final. But history proved that all laws were man-made and changed with climate and geography, varying with social and economic conditions. The man is sacred; the law is not. "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."

We cannot close without a tribute to the theologians. They do not bristle quite so much as in Vol. I. Yet they are theologians. While they have made a serious contribution to the general theme, altogether too many of them convey the impression, sometimes clearly stated, that theology lies apart from and beyond the rational processes; that the high priests thereof have private access to the holy of holies which no philosopher or zoologist may enter. Theirs may be the odor of sanctity, but the reviewer prefers the sweet reasonableness of the scientist who has no sacred preserves where the common man may not enter. Finer was the faith of Galileo, who, sweeping the heavens with his telescope, saw ten thousand new stars, than that of Cremonini, who, because theologians from the days of Aristotle had asserted there were only 1,027 stars, refused to look lest he should lose his peace and his happiness. "Don't hurt me! Leave me my peace of mind! I refuse to look through the tube" was the cry of fear, not of faith. An echo of this is heard from some of the theologians.

The editors have done a fine piece of work. The conference seems to have made marked progress, and surely ought to be continued through coming years.

I. G. MATTHEWS

New Testament Studies, edited by Edwin Prince Booth, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 290, $2.50.

This volume consists of eleven essays on recently debated problems concerning the life of Jesus and primitive Christology. It is dedicated to Professor *emeritus* W. J. Lowstuter, of Boston University, and is the work of colleagues and former students of that eminent scholar. In their ensemble the essays constitute an excellent general introduction to the modern trends and principles of investigation in the field of *Leben-Jesu-Forschung.* Not content with the arid detachment of purely critical

study, the writers have sought also to show how the results of modern criticism of the gospels, at first sight destructive and painful, may be applied to the life of man in the contemporary world and made to serve the advance of the kingdom of God.

It is perhaps significant that the first essay should deal with "Semitic Backgrounds." The writer, Professor E. A. Leslie, is concerned to remind us of the organic unity between the two Testaments, and of the importance of what he rightly calls "the distinctively Christian evaluation of history." Both in this section and in the longer part which is given to the question of the Aramaic element in the gospels, this essay is a semipopular digest of recent theories rather than a contribution to learning. The value of the Septuagint to the student of the New Testament is assessed particularly well; and the manner in which words of the Greek *koinē,* adapted to religious concepts of the Old Testament by the Alexandrian translators, were further enriched and deepened in the vocabulary of the early church is illustrated by well-chosen and well-handled examples. One reads with some surprise the statement that "for Jesus and his apostles . . . the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament was their sacred Scriptures" (p. 30). How then are we to explain the pronounced influence of noncanonical writings such as Enoch, in the Synoptics? (Cf. Burkitt's remark, "It is when you study Matthew, Mark, and Luke against the background of the Book of Enoch that you see them in their true perspective"—in *Jewish and Christian Apocalypses,* London, 1914, p. 21.)

In "The Continuing Quest of the Historical Jesus," Professor D. T. Rowlingson has undertaken to bring Schweitzer up to date, by offering an outline of the main developments since 1918. This essay will probably be found the most useful of the eleven. The theories of Streeter and his supporters, the work of the form critics and of Vincent Taylor, and the contributions of recent American scholarship are set concisely and skillfully in a true historical perspective. I am bound to regard the complete neglect of Loisy as unfortunate, although it only echoes the general failure of New Testament scholars to realize the immense importance of his work; and the bare mention of Eduard Meyer within a list hardly does justice to this unrivalled master of historical science.

It is not possible to review the essays one by one. In general, they may be said to represent the work of well-informed modern scholarship, somewhat shy of radical criticism but not in the least tempted to defend lost positions. There is little in the book that is new, but as a collective statement of the present tendencies and tasks it will help most readers to a better orientation. It is interesting to observe that while all the writers are clearly aware of the part played by the creative powers of the Christian society in the shaping of the tradition, not one of them seriously impugns the underlying validity of the record.

FRANK W. BEARE

The Contemporary Christ, by W. A. Smart, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 164, $1.50.

Dr. Smart, professor of biblical theology at Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., gave the Fondren Lectures at Southern Methodist University in 1942: these now appear in book form under the title above. Taking account of the latest work of New Testament scholars, Dr. Smart has given us a sound and sensible perspective from which to consider the significance of Jesus for modern life. He does not succumb to "the peril of modernizing Jesus" against which Dr. Cadbury warns, but on the other hand he refuses to agree that Jesus has no religious or ethical relevance for our times. What this significance is he undertakes to elucidate in these lectures.

For example, in regard to ethics Smart agrees with Dibelius as to the absolute quality of the ethical demands of Jesus, but he considers that the contention of form criticism that the teachings attributed to Jesus are really the production of the later church is an exaggeration. Why should the later church make an issue of the Sabbath question which was purely Jewish? In the gospels it is one of the major problems. There is no "denying that the gospel records have been colored by the interests of the early church and that . . . many passages in them cannot have come from Jesus' day. But it does seem fair to conclude that the gospel writers, some fifty years after the death of Jesus, were using materials some parts of which were so much earlier that they reflected a different and even an unfamiliar world. If this is true, then we may be on our guard against that type of criticism which finds in our gospels nothing but the interests of the church, or at best only the 'whisper' of the voice of Jesus" (p. 25). Smart considers that Schweitzer's notion of "interim ethics" and the later interpretation which transfers Jesus' ethical teaching to the perfected kingdom are both extreme interpretations though they contain a measure of truth. "Interim ethics fails to account for the absolute and timeless element in the teachings of Jesus, while the theory that they are the ethics of the coming kingdom loses sight of the fact that so much that Jesus said was relative to this world and had to do with how its evils should be met. There would be no evils to be met in the kingdom. . . . Thus there is no escape from accepting the moral imperative which Jesus has laid upon us" (pp. 103 f). However, the ethics of Jesus are not a fixed code, nor is his purpose fulfilled by those who would be his slavish imitators. "Christianity is a guidepost, not a hitching post."

The brevity of the discussion is not the least merit of this judicious and practical book.

GORDON POTEAT

Chiasmus in the New Testament, by Nils Wilhelm Lund, Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press, 1942, pp. xiv, 428, $4.00.

Are the writings of the New Testament of literary or of nonliterary quality? From the earliest days this query has been debated. After mentioning a dispute between a Greek and a Christian, in which the one claimed that Paul was unlearned and ignorant, the other that he was more eloquent than Plato, Chrysostom gives his judgment:

> Let us charge the apostles with want of learning, for this same charge is praise. And when they say that the apostles were rude, let us follow up the remark and say that they were also untaught, and unlettered, and poor, and vile, and stupid, and obscure. It is not slander on the apostles to say so, but it is even a glory that, being such, they should have outshone the whole world.

This was oratory; nonetheless, in more restrained form it has been repeated in substance through the years. The recent discipline styled *form criticism* has in a measure reiterated this with its insistence that the gospels and letters were essentially new departures and distinctly unliterary or nonliterary.

With this position Dean Lund vigorously disagrees. When judged by classical standards, yes; but the writings of the New Testament are essentially Semitic in thought and form (quite independent of the question whether or not they are translations into Greek from Aramaic originals), and should therefore be judged by quite different standards. Much that has been dismissed as repetitious, obscure, and illogical shines in a new light when we see what the authors really did.

One of the fundamental tools of Semitic craftsmanship for prose as well as

poetry was chiasmus, that is, the deliberate inversion of thoughts, and often actually of words—though properly chiasmus is more concerned with the order of ideas than of diction—in corresponding phrases. In its simplest form it is almost universal and has long been recognized, as in the nursery rhyme:

Old King Cole / was a merry old soul,
And a merry old soul / was he.

But as used in the Semitic world it was developed far beyond such a sample. Throughout the Old Testament it is to be found with varying degrees of complexity. At times, whole sections, as Isa. 2:1-4:6, reveal this conscious and sustained structure. It is also to be found in the classical world, especially in Homer, but its real provenance was the Semitic East.

After a somewhat lengthy discussion of this literary principle, its laws, and of various examples of it in the Old Testament, he turns to his main thesis. It is widely to be seen in the New Testament as well, and failure to recognize it has resulted in entirely unmerited strictures upon the literary style, or want of it, of the several writers, notably Paul. I Corinthians, to which as a sample he devotes a very long section, exhibits it in an astonishing degree: I Cor. VII, which falls into eight parts, is a prize example. Here, he argues, not only does Part VIII correspond with Part I, Part VII with Part II, and so on, but within these parts themselves the rigid principle is to be seen. This and even longer sustained examples are printed with an ingenious method of indentation and a bristling array of symbols reminiscent of bygone days devoted to algebra: *ABC*'s *XYZ*'s, with their corresponding opposites *Z'Y'X"*s and *C'B'A"*s. In similar vein he analyzes large sections of the Gospel of Matthew and all of the Revelation, arguing that it is everywhere to be seen. The analysis of the Sermon on the Mount (a deliberate and sustained example of chiasmus) involves some pretty clever printing and complicated explanation. Actually Matt. 4:12—11:6 is one long chiasmus teeming with little chiasmi.

His study has convinced him that this is not accidental but that on the contrary it is deliberate and conscious and intended for liturgical purposes. The consequences, if this be true, are far-reaching. Much that has seemed rough and repetitious is seen to be artistically well-nigh perfect; what might have seemed a redundancy or anticlimax may well be simply the balancing final *a* to an initial *a* in a lengthy and sustained *abcdefedcba,* which has run over several pages.

There have been many fantastic analyses of the biblical books, based upon the supposed determinative quality of the central verse or word or letter, which is to be regarded as the clew for the true and esoteric meaning of the whole. Dean Lund's volume is far removed from all this. It is a sober and restrained piece of competent and useful research. It raises so many all-important questions that any general appraisal would be premature. That this chiastic order does occur—and in startling amounts—is certain. Lund has abundantly proved it. The only question is, How deliberate and conscious was it? For example, a man could remark:

I went to the table
and sat down
and took up my napkin
and ate my dinner.
When I finished dinner,
I folded my napkin
and got up
and left the table.

So printed, it is chiasmus with a vengeance; but it happens to be true that often one does retrace his steps. If, however, as Lund argues, a passage such as Luke 4:16-21*a*

exhibits deliberate and repeated elimination and addition to a quoted passage, resulting in this *abcba* order (and for no other discernible reason), it is not so easily dismissed. One thing is certain. Dean Lund has produced a dissertation which is not lightly to be disregarded.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

Religion in Illness and Health, by Carroll A. Wise, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xiv, 279, $2.50.

For dealing with religion in its relation to illness and health the author of this book speaks with a considerable degree of authority. He has had wide experience with the severe disorders of the personality which has been supplemented by extensive counseling with so-called "normal" persons. More than that, as Protestant chaplain at the Worcester State Hospital he has been associated with some of the leading workers in the field of mental illness and in the study of its physiological correlates. The result is a challenging book, made possible by a grant from the Josiah Macy Foundation and endorsed by the Religious Book-of-the-Month Club as one of its selections.

The underlying assumption of this book is that the personality is not to be looked upon as an aggregate of separate parts but as an organism which functions as a whole within a particular environment. The whole person in his environmental relationships must therefore be taken into account if we would understand the sick stomach or heart, and in the life situation thus involved the religious factors are not least in importance.

The outstanding chapter in the book is the excellent summary of the recent findings of psychosomatic medicine regarding the influence of repressed hatred, guilt, shame, and anxiety upon high blood pressure, asthma, peptic ulcers, and other organic diseases. It seems clearly established that emotions have the power to influence structure and that the structural changes thus induced may become *irreversible.* Another high light in the book is the distinction between the "positive" and "negative" conscience and the relationship thereof to the early training of the individual.

The chapter on the emotional factors in mental illness is disappointing. No account is taken of the constructive aspects of certain types of mental illness as manifestations of nature's power to heal and their relationship to the religious conversion experience. This chapter follows the conventional psychiatric textbook and completely ignores those features of mental illness which bring an especial challenge to the student of religion. The discussion of personality structure suffers by reason of the fact that the author seems to be familiar only with the work of psychiatrists and psychologists and takes no account of the contributions of men like Dewey and Mead and Hocking.

The lack of an adequate philosophical foundation mars the entire second part of the book. The attempt is here made to philosophize regarding religion on the basis of concepts which are none too well clarified and with a minimum of concrete evidence. The proposition is thus put forth that "the functional task of religion cannot be achieved without a structure and that religious symbols constitute that structure." Nowhere in this book does one find any clarification of the process by which these symbols are incorporated into the personality and related one to another. One is also annoyed by the extent to which the term *Weltanschauung* is overworked. It is frequently used without either a definite or indefinite article in a way which seems to betoken a near-personification. One notes also a surprising inconsistency

between the proposition that value is the centre around which the personality is organized and the position that no attempt should be made to distinguish between lesser and greater values. The very heart of the problem from the standpoint of the student of religion is thus evaded.

In the matter of methodology the book would have been greatly improved if more concrete material had been used.

In spite of these adverse criticisms this book represents a new contribution of which the student of religion will do well to take account.

ANTON T. BOISEN

Paths of Life: Preface to a World Religion, by Charles Morris, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. v, 257, $3.00.

Professor Morris distinguishes three different components of human personality, each of which he spells with an initial small letter—the dionysian, promethean, and buddhistic. Each is present in every one, but they vary greatly in strength in individual persons. The dionysian component is made up of tendencies to release and indulge existent desires like hunger, sex, and companionship; it is sensuous, orgiastic. The promethean compound is the sum of active tendencies to remake the world; it is ardently progressive and promotive of social advancement; John Dewey is mentioned with admiration as one in whom this component is dominant. The buddhistic component holds desires in check; it is disposed to self-control, solitude, meditation, detachment, self-containment. Six different general types of religion have thus far appeared, in each of which the three components are present in different strengths, but all disproportionate. Individuals whose personal combination of the different components has been different from that of the religion prevailing in their culture have been discontented. The six types have been the Buddhist, Dionysian, Promethean, Apollonian, Christian, and Mohammedan (each with an initial capital letter). The seventh type, now beginning to emerge, the future world religion, is the Maitreyan; in it the three components will have equal strength and be properly balanced.

This classification is ingenious and suggestive. One may doubt whether the dionysian element has been stronger in Christianity than the promethean. Christians have often favored social reforms and seldom been sensuous and orgiastic. One suspects that Professor Morris has overlooked the distinction between *agape* and *eros* and, misled by modern translations of *agape* as "love," has supposed Christian "love" to be more sensuous in character than it usually has been (cf. p. 127). The classification of contemporary totalitarianism with Mohammedanism seems rather forced; in many respects, like social equality and the absence of any ecclesiastical orders, Islam is extremely democratic. The chief criticism of "Maitreyan religion" is that it offers no assurance of a cosmic God or a future life; its "gods" are merely symbols of human aspirations in the manner of A. Eustace Haydon. However, the New Humanists and the Societies of Ethical Culture ought to like this book.

WILLIAM KELLEY WRIGHT

The Christian Approach to the Moslem, by James Thayer Addison, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. viii, 365, $3.75.

This book makes a unique contribution to the extensive library of literature dealing with Islam and the Christian missionary approach to followers of that religion. It is not so much that it gives any new information, rather that by its method and arrangement it gives a new and unified understanding of the relations

between the two religions in their history, and therefore of the extreme difficulties that have made so very unsatisfactory and relatively unsuccessful the Christian missions to Mohammedans.

In the first part we review the circumstances of the rise of Islam and see once more how unnecessary this would have been, and even how unlikely, if only Christians had been faithful to the spirit, purpose, and program of Jesus. Then a luminous sketch is given of the contacts, conflicts, fears, hates, oppressions, and sufferings that have marked the long story of two faiths, always in more or less close physical contact but always lacking mutually in understanding and sympathy. One sees, too, how politics, greed, and imperialism have corrupted both religions.

In Part Two the Christian efforts are traced in the principal Mohammedan regions. While this covers ground better known by the ordinary student of the history of Christian missions, it is handled with freshness and in a way to give full outline pictures of what has been done in each section and under what conditioning contexts.

Part Three undertakes to give guidance for missionary approach and work among Mohammedans. It discusses with brief comprehensiveness the problems and gives practical suggestions relating to "the presentation of the message" and "the care of the convert" as these problems arise as the missionary faces an exclusive religion set in an intolerant totalitarian social order.

Appendices give summary surveys of the situation in the minor areas of Mohammedanism, where absence of the church-state relation deprives the Mohammedan institutions of control over life and opportunity. The author has been professor of the history of religion and missions in the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass. His work is that of a calm, thorough, earnest, fair scholar.

W. O. CARVER

Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore, by Karl Lehmann-Hartleben and Erling C. Olsen, Baltimore, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, and Walters Art Gallery, 1942, pp. 82 and 18 pages of plates, $1.50.

It is not generally known that a new approach to the study of ancient religions through the interpretation of art is steadily growing, in spite of the opposition of traditional archæologists, philologians, and historians of religion alike. Those who are interested in the religious background of Christianity cannot do better than to read this book at once, for it is a brilliant contribution to this new type of study. And those who are not thus interested should know that they are blinding themselves to one of the most important sources of knowledge of the texture and spirit of early Christianity itself.

The method of this new study is to reconstruct, almost as one does a new language from strange hieroglyphs, the religious meaning of satyrs, Victory, Erotes, Medusa, snakes, doors, trees, and the rest of the symbols of the age. As a starting point for their contribution to this study the authors have here concentrated on a small number of definitely related sarcophagi from a single family tomb, most of which are fortunately in Baltimore. Beautifully illustrated and clearly written, the nonspecialist can pick up the book with complete confidence that he will follow it throughout, though there may be sections which he cannot read critically, as was the case with the reviewer when he came to the technical last section on the dates of the sarcophagi.

From the point of view of religious history, the authors show that these sarcophagi decorations reveal a vital hope for immortality, and a definite notion that

immortality can be achieved only by identifying in some way one's soul with divinity. The authors purposely stop short of generalizations about the religion of the time, and bring in general conclusions even about sarcophagi only by inference, or in passing, while they keep to their task of expounding the sarcophagi of this group. But the generalizations are transparently there. And it is equally transparent that when the same symbols (or the majority of them) are soon being used by Jews, and then Christians, they have the same basic meaning as that which the authors here suggest for them in paganism.

There is space for only a few suggestions. The authors have made a splendid beginning with Victory, as, in effect, the pagan counterpart of Paul's cry "O grave, where is thy victory?" Through the mystic relation with the god, man has won a new victory, victory, precisely, over the grave. But the authors are content with a quite inadequate discussion of the birth of the divine child (pp. 32 f.), the identity of the child with the father, that child who makes the father more easily accessible and who takes the mother herself to heaven, while the mother is also the child's wife (p. 39). With this goes the still more cryptic presentation of the god as hermaphrodite (pp. 34 f.). The relations of these notions the authors do not seem clearly to see, while their religious importance in paganism and Christianity alike is left for the reader to discover. There is much more to be said about what I am calling the "round objects" which appear prominently in many designs of the period, objects which appear here as "cymbals" (p. 50). The meaning of Medusa heads, of hunting scenes, indeed of all the "horrible" in the symbolism, a horrible which is becoming beautiful as the Medusa head is in process of change to the Christian seraph, is not directly faced at all. But the fact that more is to be done must not obscure the brilliance of the present achievement.

ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH

Christian Europe Today, by Adolph Keller, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. x, 310, $3.00.

If anyone is qualified to write about Christian Europe today, especially about the church in Germany which is so near to his own Switzerland, Adolph Keller is the man. Dr. Keller, one of the great irenic liaison officers of ecumenical Christianity, sets forth the facts without fear and without favor. About some churches his information is limited (as about the Russian church today); in some instances, where it seems necessary for safety, he suppresses names. But in general he is amply informed, and free from partisanship—except the partisanship against totalitarian cruelty, racialism, and religious and ideological persecutions.

No matter what books one has read, religious or secular, every thoughtful Christian should read this book. It will check hasty generalizations, will open perspectives of both horror and hope, and above all will strengthen the conviction that the present world revolution is more truly a spiritual struggle than a military warfare, than an economic breakdown, or even than racial hatreds. Wars, economics, and racial attitudes root in the fundamental values of a society. Daily bread, as Keller points out, is a problem of faith.

After introductory discussions, Dr. Keller presents the churches under the cross. He shows, with fresh evidence, the sufferings and divisions and loyalties (open and secret) of the German church in particular. His treatment of Bolshevist Russia is less precise and less up-to-date. He describes the anti-Christian policy of the Russian state, in spite of which up to 1938 about 40% of the Russians, accord-

ing to a statement of the Communist party, remained faithful to Christian tradition. The League of the Godless numbered only 3,450,182 members by June 1, 1941. But the anti-Christian policies of Russia have been merciless. "America still does not understand the European fear of Communism." It appears to this reviewer that Keller, in his combat against Russian irreligion, goes too far in regarding Russian economic reforms as merely materialistic. He also errs in rejecting the classless society, which means only a society in which no one is exploiter and none exploited, but which Keller identifies with hatred and force.

In regard to Germany, he warns against exaggerations. At present, he says, there are perhaps hardly more than a dozen preachers in concentration camp, not the reported 300. But the truth is tragic enough. He points out that Catholics are persecuted more than Protestants, because Hitler is more afraid of them, yet that the Church is diplomatic.

The section entitled "The Church Answers with Faith" is especially important for American Christians to read, because it contains so many gleams of hope for the future that may serve as a basis for reconciliation after the war. A concluding section sketches "a vision of reconstruction."

As reporter and as Christian, Keller is superb. As philosopher and theologian, however, he is not on the same level. He finds himself face to face with the problem of evil in its most dreadful historic form. He is a personal friend of Karl Barth, who for a while was his assistant pastor; but he does not quite know how far to go with Barth or whether Barth has really repudiated his former views and gone over to activism by his recent support of the war against Hitler. He plays with the idea of demonology as an explanation of recent world events, but fails to define it clearly. He touches on the idea of a finite God whose good will is limited by other factors, and quotes Boehme, W. Monod, and H. G. Wells, without really wrestling with the problem or considering the abundant American literature on it. One may judge that his mind is open in many directions; but he is clear only at the point of his allegiance to Jesus.

His treatment of English and American theologians is incidental to his main purpose, but his omissions are especially interesting. He ignores the greatest British philosophical theologian, F. R. Tennant, as well as the greatest American in that field, A. C. Knudson. He also omits H. N. Wieman and W. E. Hocking, neither of whom could be ignored in any attempt to understand American religious thought.

A question might be raised about the reason for Barth's exile from Germany, which Keller ascribes to Barth's refusal to give the Hitler salute. An earlier report had it that Barth was willing to give the salute, but was exiled because he insisted that Christians might be of two minds about who set the Reichstag fire. Which story is true?

The publishers should have given Dr. Keller more help in English form. You cannot speak of a girl who "makes psychological studies" (p. 63); nor of "luck," when you really mean good fortune (p. 71); nor quote Christ as saying, "Don't be afraid," when "Fear not" is available (p. 161); above all, one may not say "Byzanz" for Byzantium in an English context.

Such defects are minor, and do not subtract from the value of a challenging and disturbing book.

EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN

BOOK NOTICES

The Pastor's Legal Adviser, by Norton F. Brand and Verner M. Ingram, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 237, $2.00.

Should one be inclined to question the need of such a book as this, a reading of this volume written by two lawyers for ministers will give a complete answer to all doubt on that score, for in it the clergyman will find abundant reminder that he does not function *in vacuo* and that while his citizenship may be in heaven many of his rights and responsibilities must be exercised and discharged under the limitations set by the law of the land. This reviewer finds the plan of the book worthy of high praise. It is divided into four parts, the first of which covers "Basic Religious Rights," dealing with religious liberty and its limitations, of particular interest being the all too brief discussion of the troubled question of what coöperation between the public school and the church school for religious weekday education is permitted under the law. Part Two deals with "Church Organizations," with discussion of such matters as the incorporation of churches, the function of church trustees, and the rights of members and ministers. Part Three discusses "Church Property"; would that every pastor and church official might heed the wise counsel given in this section with reference to the carrying of adequate insurance upon church property! But it is really in Part Four, where the authors discuss such pastoral activities and relationships as arise out of the laws regulating marriages, copyrights, and wills, that the busy pastor will find a treatment of issues that he will most certainly have to face in any normal ministerial career. This is not to say that he will here find an answer to all his questions. For example: in any particular State the marriage between a white person and an American Indian may or may not be permitted by the law of that State. This book does not tell which States do or do not prohibit such a marriage. But it does put the clergyman on notice that such a marriage is illegal in some States and thus warn him of the necessity of seeking competent legal advice if and when such a question arises. This illustration suggests both the value and the limitations of this book. Theological seminaries would do well to see that their students gave this book a careful reading, but should not fail to remind them that "He who is his own lawyer has a fool for a client." Note may be made of an error in p. 200 (2nd line in 2nd paragraph) where "donor" should read "donee."

JOHN HENRY DAY

Your Morale and How to Build It, by Austin Pardue, New York, Scribner, 1942, pp. 132, $1.50.

This modest volume consists of a collection of brief essays apparently originally prepared as addresses to a radio audience, though they would do nicely for vesper talks in these troubled days. As dean of St. Paul's Cathedral in Buffalo it is quite possible the author has found opportunity to combine his audiences.

There is much in this book which will prove helpful to the casual reader for whom it seems to have been written. The language is simple and clear, the arguments are direct, constructive, and convincing. The anecdotes around which the lessons are woven are sufficiently arresting to hold attention, and they lead interestingly and logically to the development of more serious thought.

The reader is given to understand that these essays were written with especial

reference to the problem of keeping up morale, personal and social, in war time. The truth is, many of them would be wholesome reading at any time: we always do well to face our fears, we always need to be reminded of the helpfulness of prayer, we are always in need of greater faith, and any book which urges our thought toward these spiritual fundamentals of life is hardly to be classified as merely a tract for the times.

It is true, however, that these are days when nerves are worn more threadbare than usual, and the strain on faith and courage is severe. For that reason the sane advice and practical common sense of this book will make it welcome among those who are not satisfied with superficial solutions or with sentimental optimism. It is a book to commend to the discouraged, to the fearful, and also to the occasional self-centred and self-satisfied individual who needs a bit of a jolt.

HENRY C. NEWELL

Patterns of the Mind, by Lynn Harold Hough, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. 135, $1.50.

Consisting of a set of five lectures delivered at the Florida School of Religion in January, 1942, this little volume restricts its consideration of the patterns of the mind to those which reveal modes of dealing with the problems and aims that life presents; and, naturally enough, displays the shortcomings of unskilled and fallacious pattern-makers with due insistence upon the necessity for a personal religion that shall be vital in both practical and sublime aspects.

In the central lectures the work presents a solid analysis not only of a diversity of factors that lead to tempting but unstable patterns but also of the crux of the whole problem, *viz.,* "It is when impersonal principles become the basis of human choices that they become significant for the life of man. The thinker and the man of action alike must live at the place where freedom meets impersonal truths and turns them into living meaning."

However, in the opening and closing chapters, though protesting against "the heady wine of a luscious sentimentality," there is much of this very quality—a style that begs its own questions repeatedly and a doctrine that assumes that the healing of the "sick soul," the "twice-born," is the object of true religion and especially of Christianity.

J. C. SCAMMELL

Who Walk Alone, by Perry Burgess, New York, Henry Holt, 1942 (special edition), pp. viii, 312, free.

This is one of the most beautiful and moving stories I have ever read. When first published in 1940, it received a *National Book Award,* an honor for that year shared only by *How Green Was My Valley* and *As I Remember Him.* It is the almost incredible story of what one man did—an American businessman and former soldier, who discovered, when life was at its richest, that he was a leper. How he met that situation and instead of going to the wall made the remainder of his life a blessing to others and a glory to himself is told superbly. If you are like me, you will read it to the end, however late the hour is, and you will know you have been standing on holy ground. Ned, Tomas, Carita, Father Marello, Sister Victoire, Major Thompson prove something about life which we sometimes forget. The following excerpts from a letter to the editor from the Leonard Wood Memorial (One Madison Avenue, New York City) are self-explanatory:

We are writing to ask if you will bring to the attention of your readers our offer of a special edition of *Who Walk Alone,* autographed by the author, without any obligation except that they will ask at least ten of their friends to read it.

We hope that thousands of readers in this way will learn that the universal horror of the leper is without reason, and that their interest may be sufficiently aroused to help us prosecute our scientific efforts to eradicate the disease.

Through the generosity of the publishers and the author this edition of the book is being printed without profit to anyone.

Our readers will make no mistake in accepting this offer and sharing the volume with their friends. This volume is not to be confused with a tract or disguised plea for funds. It is a novel for which thousands of people gladly paid $2.75.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

The First Authorized English Bible and the Cranmer Preface, by Harold R. Willoughby, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1942, pp. 50, 7 plates, $1.00.

In the fascinating story of the birth and growth of the English Bible the chapter devoted to the rightly styled *Great Bible* has an important place. During the years 1539-1541 no less than seven editions of it appeared with at least 20,000 copies. Professor Willoughby's admirable monograph appropriately marks the four hundredth anniversary of this significant achievement. As he is well-fitted to do, after briefly retelling the interesting story of the difficulties incident to its production, he discusses critically its superb typography, its title page commonly (but mistakenly) attributed to Hans Holbein the Younger, and the preface or prologue by Archbishop Cranmer, which served as introduction to all save the first printing. The title page and this prologue (the latter for the first time) are reproduced in facsimile at the end of the monograph, while the text of this important and strangely neglected document, slightly modernized, is printed in full. Those who know the punctiliously careful work of Professor Willoughby, a recognized authority on iconography and bookmaking, will not need to be assured that the monography is copiously annotated and equipped with a full bibliography. Both author and publisher are to be congratulated on this choice little study.

MORTON S. ENSLIN

The Making of the Synoptic Gospels, by B. K. Rattey, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. 72, $0.75.

This is one of a series of brief and inexpensive *Biblical Handbooks* by British scholars. The author of a volume, *The Growth and Structure of the Gospels,* has condensed into short compass the facts generally held concerning the origin of the three oldest canonical gospels. He gives some slight attention to the implications of form criticism, and to the theory of Proto-Luke, to mention two of the newer matters in his summary. He accepts the traditional authorship of Mark and Luke and salvages the tradition of St. Matthew as a writer by claiming that Q was first put into writing by that Apostle. In admitting a considerable amount of editorial freedom in all the gospels he leaves room for a number of less conservative deductions. Thus he suggests that the so-called Judean ministry in Mark represents a collection of incidents from more than one visit to Jerusalem. While the specialist will learn little that is new from this compact book, he can recommend it to the general reader.

HENRY J. CADBURY

Two or Three Gathered Together, by Glenn Clark, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. 154, $1.25.

Many will know Glenn Clark by virtue of other volumes within the devotional area, *The Soul's Sincere Desire* and *I Will Lift Up Mine Eyes,* and also because

of his nation-wide leadership of conferences on prayer. He is almost the leader of another *movement,* though he denies this—a *kingdom of God movement* like Kagawa's in Japan. This volume comes, warm and vital, out of this call to prayer. It is a sane and wholesome devotional document of high order. To me, his every consideration seems relevant and rational; not so, however, I should assume, to the nontheistic humanist. His call is to all men and women who love God in Christ, and who honestly believe that God hears and answers, to join with others around the world in asking the Father to use them as a channel for the manifestation of his grace and power. The author offers a threefold technique, namely, the quiet hour, practicing the Presence, and the prayer group. Each of these he elaborates in turn, setting them forth as suggestive only, not as the *sine qua non* of success. And finally, he envisions the power of God, released by prayer, as effective to meet the nation's needs, to inspire a Christian economy, and to establish an era of world-wide peace.

W. R. McNUTT

You Are My Friends, by Frank C. Laubach, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. x, 194, and 15 plates, $1.50.

The author is a mystic, and his book is essentially the record of a mystic's insights and experiences. An earlier book, *Letters of a Modern Mystic,* went through a number of printings. He writes graphically and beautifully. I characterize the content as devotional literature of high order; it will feed the religiously hungry and give them strength in the Lord. It is not a book for the critically minded; he will be irritated by what, were the author writing poetry, one might call "poetic license," for instance, "He loves us sick, because his joy is to make us well. If he could not work miracles, it would be intolerable misery for him to look upon suffering, captive mankind. But because he is a creator and a miracle worker, he feels sorrow and joy at the same time." Again, "The cross is the most terrifying fact in all history; it hangs over the universe holding a bleeding heart that was lacerated for you and me." The volume is full of such overstatement of fact, bordering on religious sentimentality. But who can understand the mystic save a mystic? At the end are fourteen art reproductions of our Lord, some of them of the masters; they have little connection with the book as a whole.

W. R. McNUTT

Strength for Service to God and Country, edited by Norman E. Nygaard, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 375, $0.75.

This is a timely devotional book, designed to meet the needs of American men in the service of the nation. Its brief but vital daily meditations and prayers come from 370 writers—clergymen, educators, and business men—some of world-wide repute, but all capable of giving messages of courage and cheer. The volume is attractive in form, convenient in size, and reasonable in price. It is an ideal gift for the boys who have left their homes at the call of their country.

RITTENHOUSE NEISSER

BOOKS RECEIVED

Living Abundantly, by Frank E. Burkhalter, Nashville, Broadman, 1942, pp. 144, $0.60.

A study book in Christian stewardship written for teacher training classes conducted by the Southern Baptist Convention. It is definitely denominational in its approach.

Altars under the Sky, by Dorothy Wells Pease, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 159, $1.00.

A little volume of well-chosen poems, scripture passages, and prayers for lovers of the open: "Wherever there is beauty in the out-of-doors—there we may find God."

**This Seed of Faith,* by Henry M. Battenhouse, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 192, $1.50.

**English Institute Annual—1941,* edited by Rudolf Kirk, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xi, 248, $2.50.

**Religion in Colonial America,* by William Warren Sweet, New York, Scribner, 1942, pp. xiii, 367, $3.00.

Participation in Rural Life, by Mildred Biggs Young, Wallingford (Pa.), Pendle Hill Pamphlet 19, 1942, pp. 41, $0.15.

**State Housing Agencies,* by Dorothy Schaffter, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xiii, 808, $7.50.

Meditations for Days and Seasons, by M. K. W. Heicher, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. xix, 271, $2.50.

**Goals and Desires of Man,* by Paul Schilder, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, xii, 305, $4.00.

**Motives for Christian Living,* by William P. King, New York, Harper, 1942, pp. viii, 188, $1.50.

Golden Rain, by Patience Strong, New York, Dutton, 1942, pp. 64, $0.50.

Our parched earth needs this "golden rain." To read one line means to read it through. Only rarely is an author so appropriately named.

**The Religious Availability of Whitehead's God,* by Stephen Lee Ely, Madison (Wisc.), University of Wisconsin Press, 1942, pp. 58, $1.25.

Music and the Scriptures, by I. E. Reynolds, Nashville, Broadman, 1942, pp. 149, $0.60.

Since the author has discovered in the Bible a large number of references (painstakingly reprinted) which can—often with some effort—be associated with music, he concludes that we can sing and play without trepidation.

**Moses,* by John W. Flight, Boston, Beacon Press, 1942, pp. xi, 146, and plates, $1.75.

**A Guide for Teachers* [to Flight's *Moses*], by Edna L. Acheson, Boston, Beacon Press, 1942, pp. 48, $0.60.

**The Life of a Mind,* by Emile Cailliet, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. ix, 79, $1.25.

**We Believe,* by John J. Moment, New York, Macmillan, 1942, pp. v, 134, $1.25.

**The Christian and the War,* by Charles Clayton Morrison, Chicago, Willett, Clark, 1942, pp. 145, $1.50.

The Pastor's Helpmate, by Douglass Scarborough McDaniel, Nashville, Broadman, 1942, pp. 144, $1.00.

A minister's wife writes to "all those handmaidens of the Lord, timid, tireless, or tired, who have been, who are, or who shall be co-workers of the Father, with the undershepherds of his flock."

**The United Nations of the World,* by Haridas T. Muzumdar, New York, University Publishing, 1942, pp. xvi, 288, $2.50.

**The Bible Is Human,* by Louis Wallis, New York, Columbia University Press, 1942, pp. xi, 330, $2.50.

**About Ourselves,* by James G. Needham, Lancaster (Pa.), Jaques Cattell Press, 1941, pp. xi, 276, $3.00.

**The Spiritual Life,* by Edgar Sheffield Brightman, Nashville, Abingdon-Cokesbury, 1942, pp. 218, $2.00.

* To be reviewed.

ANNUAL INDEX

I

ARTICLES

By Title

America's Heritage of Colonial Culture (*R. E. E. Harkness*), 278
Another Essay on Circles (*W. R. McNutt*), 109
Because We Are Christians (*Henry C. Newell*), 14
Building for Tomorrow (*I. G. Matthews*), 261
Cadmus and the Greek Alphabet (*William N. Bates*), 126
Can We Have the Fruits of Democracy without the Roots? (*Gordon Poteat*), 3
Christian Ethics and the Way of the Cross (*Amos N. Wilder*), 135
Christianity and the Will of God (*Thomas Saunders*), 115
Church Tomorrow, The (*George E. Levy*), 22
French Revolution and the American Clergy, The (*Oliver W. Elsbree*), 194
Further Comments on Christian Ethics (*Alban G. Widgery*), 28
Images of Yahweh (*William A. Irwin*), 292
Layman Observes the Minister, The (*A. C. Reid*), 173
Man Neglected by Science and Education (*Peter A. Bertocci*), 209
Melanippides Essays Hermeneutics (*Matthias R. Heilig*), 182
Mission Finance in the Apostolic Age (*Frederick M. Derwacter*), 47
Music and Mores (*Harmon M. Gehr*), 302
Notes on M. C. Otto's Discussion of "Christian Essentials" (*Edgar S. Brightman*), 20
Present Tasks for Old Testament Scholars (*Robert H. Pfeiffer*), 223
Puritan and the Anglican Spirit, The (*James S. Dauerty*), 89
Roger Williams Goes to Rome (*Morton S. Enslin*), 311
Significance of Adventism (*Winston L. King*), 218
Some Recent English Books in Church History (*John T. McNeill*), 51
Some Reflections on the Nature of Religion (*A. Irving Hallowell*), 269
Springtime Legends in India (*W. Norman Brown*), 98
Tongues of Men, or of Angels? The (*John C. Scammell*), 36

. . . . . .

Book Notices: 81, 166, 250, 335. *See Index II*
Books Received: 87, 172, 259, 339
Book Reviews: 62, 143, 234, 321. *See Index II*
From Off the Campus and On: 60, 141, 232, 319

By Authors

Bates, William N. (*Cadmus and the Greek Alphabet*), 126
Bertocci, Peter A. (*The Man Neglected by Science and Education*), 209
Brightman, Edgar S. (*Notes on M. C. Otto's Discussion of "Christian Essentials"*), 20
Brown, W. Norman (*Springtime Legends in India*), 98
Dauerty, James S. (*The Puritan and the Anglican Spirit*), 89
Derwacter, Frederick M. (*Mission Finance in the Apostolic Age*), 47
Elsbree, Oliver W. (*The French Revolution and the American Clergy*), 194
Enslin, Morton S. (*Roger Williams Goes to Rome*), 311
Gehr, Harmon M. (*Music and Mores*), 302
Hallowell, A. Irving (*Some Reflections on the Nature of Religion*), 269
Harkness, R. E. E. (*America's Heritage of Colonial Culture*), 278

Heilig, Matthias R. (*Melanippides Essays Hermeneutics*), 182
Irwin, William A. (*Images of Yahweh*), 292
King, Winston L. (*The Significance of Adventism*), 218
Levy, George E. (*The Church Tomorrow*), 22
Matthews, I. G. (*Building for Tomorrow*), 261
McNeill, John T. (*Some Recent English Books in Church History*), 51
McNutt, W. R. (*Another Essay on Circles*), 109
Newell, Henry C. (*Because We Are Christians*), 14
Pfeiffer, Robert H. (*Present Tasks for Old Testament Scholars*), 223
Poteat, Gordon (*Can We Have the Fruits of Democracy without the Roots?*), 3
Reid, A. C. (*The Layman Observes the Minister*), 173
Saunders, Thomas (*Christianity and the Will of God*), 115
Scammell, John C. (*The Tongues of Men, or of Angels?*), 36
Widgery, Alban G. (*Further Comments on Christian Ethics*), 28
Wilder, Amos N. (*Christian Ethics and the Way of the Cross*), 135

II

BOOKS REVIEWS AND NOTICES

The reviews are arranged alphabetically by authors. The names of the reviewers (in parentheses) follow the titles.

Acomb, E. M., *The French Laic Laws* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 170
Adams, D. E., *Man of God* (M. S. ENSLIN), 66
Addison, J. T., *The Christian Approach to the Moslem* (W. O. CARVER), 331
Albright, W. F., *Archæology and the Religion of Israel* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 252
Aries, L. P., *Let's Talk It Over!* (F. B. IGLER), 169
Auld, W. M., *Christmas Traditions* (W. R. MC NUTT), 170
Baker, Jr., G. C., *An Introduction to the History of Early New England Methodism* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 168
Barnett, A. E., *Paul Becomes a Literary Influence* (M. S. ENSLIN), 72
Barth, Karl, *This Christian Cause* (M. S. ENSLIN), 153
Berry, G. R., *The Old Testament: A Liability or an Asset?* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 83
Birnbaum, Philip, *The Arabic Commentary of Yefet ben 'Ali the Karaite on the Book of Hosea* (J. A. MONTGOMERY), 324
Blakney, R. B., *Meister Eckhart* (G. W. DAVIS), 156
Boettner, Loraine, *The Atonement* (G. W. DAVIS), 171
Booth, E. P., *New Testament Studies* (F. W. BEARE), 326
Boylan, M. T., *Social Welfare in the Catholic Church* (GORDON POTEAT), 85
Braden, C. S., *Man's Quest for Salvation* (A. E. HAYDON), 234
Bradshaw, M. J., *Philosophical Foundations of Faith* (G. W. DAVIS), 71
Brame, I. J., *The Technique of Christian Living* (W. R. MC NUTT), 85
Brand, N. F., and Ingram, V. M., *The Pastor's Legal Adviser* (J. H. DAY), 335
Brown, W. A., *A Creed for Free Men* (D. C. MACINTOSH), 150
Buckham, J. W., *The Inner World* (M. C. OTTO), 147
Burgess, Perry, *Who Walk Alone* (M. S. ENSLIN), 336
Burroughs, P. E., *Fifty Fruitful Years* (J. H. FRANKLIN), 82
Burrows, Millar, *What Mean These Stones?* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 74
Buss, C. A., *War and Diplomacy in Eastern Asia* (GORDON POTEAT), 84
Buttrick, G. A., *Prayer* (MITCHELL BRONK), 157
Calkins, Raymond, *How Jesus Dealt with Men* (W. R. MC NUTT), 166
Campbell, S. A., *The Grit to Grapple with Life* (W. R. MC NUTT), 258
Carver, W. O., *Christian Missions in Today's World* (J. H. FRANKLIN), 255
Case, S. J., *Christianity in a Changing World* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 68
Clark, Glenn, *Two or Three Gathered Together* (W. R. MC NUTT), 337

Clark, T. C., *Poems for Life* (C. E. BATTEN), 171
Clarke, G. A., *The Pathway to the Cross* (GORDON POTEAT), 257
Clarkson, J. D., and Cochran, T. C., *War as a Social Institution* (GORDON POTEAT), 254
Coleman, Michael, *Faith under Fire* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 245
Comfort, W. W., *Stephen Grellet* (G. W. DAVIS), 250
Curtis, B. S., *Sacred Scriptures and Religious Philosophy* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 257
Daily, Starr, *Release* (GORDON POTEAT), 252
Day, John, *An Economic History of Athens under Roman Domination* (M. S. ENSLIN), 257
De la Bedoyère, Michael, *Christian Crisis* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 246
Dicks, R. L., *Who Is My Patient?* (W. R. MC NUTT), 256
Eddy, Sherwood, *Maker of Men* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 167
Ergang, Robert, *The Potsdam Führer* (G. W. DAVIS), 78
Ferré, N. F. S., *The Christian Faith* (G. W. DAVIS), 236
Fleming, D. J., *The World at One in Prayer* (W. R. MC NUTT), 257
Fosdick, H. E., *Living under Tension* (J. H. FRANKLIN), 83
Gill, F. C., *New Horizons* (J. H. FRANKLIN), 256
Gondin, W. R., *Prefaces to Inquiry* (G. W. DAVIS), 169
Goodspeed, E. J., *A History of Early Christian Literature* (M. S. ENSLIN), 321
Gordon, C. H., *The Living Past* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 158
Groves, E. R., *Christianity and the Family* (GORDON POTEAT), 255
Hart, Hornell, *New Gateways to Creative Living* (W. R. MC NUTT), 84
Heard, Gerald, *A Dialogue in the Desert* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 247
Heermance, E. L., *The Time Stream* (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 242
Heidel, Alexander, *The Babylonian Genesis* (J. B. PRITCHARD), 323
Heller, Bernard, *The Odyssey of a Faith* (S. S. COHON), 322
Hewitt, A. W., *God's Back Pasture* (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 75
Hough, L. H., *The Christian Criticism of Life* (G. W. DAVIS), 75
Patterns of the Mind (J. C. SCAMMELL), 336
Jefferson, H. B., *Experience and the Christian Faith* (D. C. MACINTOSH), 148
Keller, Adolph, *Christian Europe Today* (E. S. BRIGHTMAN), 333
Kepler, T. S., *Contemporary Religious Thought* (G. W. DAVIS), 168
Knapp, Shepherd, *The Liberated Bible* (W. R. MC NUTT), 86
Knox, John, *Religion and the Present Crisis* (H. C. NEWELL), 241
Latourette, K. S., *The Unquenchable Light* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 145
Laubach, F. C., *You Are My Friends* (W. R. MC NUTT), 338
Lehmann-Hartleben, K., and Olsen, E. C., *Dionysiac Sarcophagi in Baltimore* (E. R. GOODENOUGH), 332
Ligon, E. N., *The Psychology of Christian Personality* (J. B. PRATT), 66
Lord, F. T., *Conquest of Death* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 162
Love, J. P., *The Missionary Message of the Bible* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 167
Lund, N. W., *Chiasmus in the New Testament* (M. S. ENSLIN), 328
Macfarland, C. S., *Current Religious Thought* (H. P. VAN DUSEN), 86
A Digest of Christian Thinking (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 253
Mather, E. P., *Barclay in Brief* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 254
Maynard, Theodore, *The Story of American Catholicism* (C. H. MOEHLMAN), 143
McKinney, B. B., and Graves, A. W., *Let Us Sing* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 258
McNutt, W. R., *Worship in the Churches* (L. A. WEIGLE), 62
Miller, R. C., *What We Can Believe* (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 162
Minear, P. S., *And Great Shall Be Your Reward* (M. S. ENSLIN), 84
Morgenstern, Julian, *Amos Studies* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 69
Morris, Charles, *Paths of Life* (W. K. WRIGHT), 331
Myers, A. J. W., *Religion for Today* (L. C. KITCHEN), 239
Nottingham, E. K., *Methodism and the Frontier* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 77
Nygaard, N. E., *Strength for Service to God and Country* (RITTENHOUSE NEISSER), 338

O'Connor, J. J., *Catholic Revival in England* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 253
Ostergaard, S. K., *Into Abundance* (R. H. ABRAMS), 165
Pardue, Austin, *Your Morale and How to Build It* (H. C. NEWELL), 335
Paton, William, *The Church and the New Order* (J. H. FRANKLIN), 82
Petry, R. C., *Francis of Assisi* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 159
Pfeiffer, R. H., *Introduction to the Old Testament* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 63
Poteat, E. M., *These Shared His Power* (A. N. WILDER), 146
Powell, E. E., *Spinoza and Religion* (G. W. DAVIS), 77
Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work (R. H. ABRAMS), 163
Quinlan, M. J., *Victorian Prelude* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 160
Rattey, B. K., *The Making of the Synoptic Gospels* (H. J. CADBURY), 337
Reid, A. C., *Invitation to Worship* (M. S. ENSLIN), 255
Richardson, Alan, *The Miracle-Stories of the Gospels* (M. S. ENSLIN), 252
Robinson, B. W., *Jesus in Action* (J. P. BERKELEY), 240
Rolston, Holmes, *The Social Message of the Apostle Paul* (A. N. WILDER), 248
Science, Philosophy, and Religion: A Symposium (I. G. MATTHEWS), 325
Sellers, O. R., and Voigt, Edwin, *Biblical Hebrew for Beginners* (I. G. MATTHEWS), 164
Sharpe, D. R., *Walter Rauschenbusch* (MITCHELL BRONK), 235
Sikorsky, I. I., *The Message of the Lord's Prayer* (J. H. FRANKLIN), 166
Smart, W. A., *The Contemporary Christ* (GORDON POTEAT), 327
Smith, H. S., *Faith and Nurture* (W. R. MC NUTT), 80
Sockman, R. W., *The Highway of God* (W. R. MC NUTT), 238
Southworth, J. G., *Vauxhall Gardens* (R. E. KEIGHTON), 171
Stifler, F. C., *Every Man's Book* (MITCHELL BRONK), 81
Strachan, R. H., *The Fourth Gospel* (M. S. ENSLIN), 251
Straton, H. H., *Baptists: Their Message and Mission* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 73
Tigner, H. S., *No Sign Shall Be Given* (GORDON POTEAT), 256
Tittle, E. F., *The Lord's Prayer* (M. S. ENSLIN), 166
Torrey, C. C., *Documents of the Primitive Church* (G. B. KING), 151
Trueblood, D. E., *The Logic of Belief* (G. W. DAVIS), 243
VanKirk, W. W., *Religion and the World of Tomorrow* (J. H. FRANKLIN), 154
Walsh, G. G., *Medieval Humanism* (R. E. E. HARKNESS), 251
Welch, E. P., *The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl* (N. F. S. FERRÉ), 155
Whale, J. S., *Christian Doctrine* (DANIEL EVANS), 64
Wieman, H. N., *Now We Must Choose* (GORDON POTEAT), 85
Wieman, R. W., *The Family Lives Its Religion* (W. R. MC NUTT), 86
Willoughby, H. R., *The First Authorized English Bible and the Cranmer Preface* (M. S. ENSLIN), 337
Wilson, P. W., *Newtopia* (H. W. SMITH), 81
Wise, C. A., *Religion in Illness and Health* (A. T. BOISEN), 330